DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 854 IR 011 944

AUTHOR	Jones, Paul E.
TITLE	The 1983-84 Maryland ITV Utilization Study.
INSTITUTION	Towson State Coll., Md.
SPONS AGENCY	Maryland State Dept. of Education, Owings Mills. Div. of Instructional Television.
PUB DATE	Dec 84
NOTE	200p.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Measures; *Educational Television; Elementary Secondary Education; Public Schools; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *State Surveys; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

Designed to follow-up a 1981 survey, this study assessed the current status of instructional television (ITV) utilization in the public schools of Maryland and compared current usage with that of the 1980-81 school year. Separate questionnaires organized around four major study questions were designed for teachers, library media specialists, principals, and ITV coordinators, and sent to a stratified sample of 209 schools. The appropriate instruments were completed by 209 principals, 209 library media specialists, and 1,045 classroom teachers, i.e., five teachers in each school. In addition, 24 ITV coordinators for public school systems received an instrument. The results of the survey indicated that: (1) ITV continues to be widely available in all Maryland public schools; (2) the most serious problem related to availability continues to be scheduling; (3) there is a positive commitment to ITV as indicated by the increase in ITV equipment and facilities during the past three years as well as by plans for increases during the next three years; and (4) the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward ITV is generally positive. Appendices include the survey sample, cover letters to all participants, and addenda to teachers' questionnaires. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

ED264854

THE 1983-84 MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY

PAUL E. JONES
DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY
TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION
MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
11767 BONITA AVENUE
OWINGS MILLS, MARYLAND 21117

DECEMBER 1984

IR011944

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paul E. Jones
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The 1983-84 Maryland ITV Utilization Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the present usage of ITV in the public schools of Maryland. Data was collected related to four questions: 1. To what extent is ITV available in the Maryland public schools? 2. To what extent are teachers, principals, library media specialists and systems ITV coordinators committed to the area of ITV? 3. To what extent is ITV actually used in Maryland public schools? 4. What attitudes are held by principals, teachers, library media specialists, and systems ITV coordinators? A variation of stratified random sampling was used which yielded a sample of 209 Maryland public schools. Based upon the results of the study, the following conclusions were made: 1. ITV continues to be widely available in all Maryland public schools. In addition, television sets are available, and most teachers feel that it is relatively easy to obtain a set for classroom use. 2. The most serious problem related to availability continues to be scheduling. Some hope for improving this condition lies in the increase in the availability of video recording equipment in individual schools. 3. There is a positive commitment to ITV as indicated by the increase in ITV equipment and facilities during the past three years as well as plans for increases during the next three years. 4. The perception of attitudes toward ITV is generally positive.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

INTRODUCTION

Background 1
Purpose 1
Related Studies 2
Method 2
Sample 3
Administration 4
The Data 5

RESULTS

TEACHERS

Introduction 6
Background Information 6
Availability of Instructional Television 8
Utilization of ITV 17
Typical Use of ITV Series 29
Support of ITV 31
Teachers' Preparation for Use of ITV 45
Conditions Affecting the Use of ITV 46
Comments on ITV 51
Conclusion 60

LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS

Introduction 61
Background Information 61
Availability of Instructional Television 64
Support of ITV 76
Utilization of ITV 81
Library Media Specialists' Preparation for Use of ITV 95
Reactions to Use of ITV 96
Comments on ITV 109
Conclusion 112

PRINCIPALS

Introduction 113
Background Information 113
Availability of Instructional Television 115
Support of ITV 125
Principals' Preparation for Use of ITV 136
Reactions to Use of ITV 137
Comments on ITV 153
Conclusion 154

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

INTRODUCTION

- Background 1
- Purpose 1
- Related Studies 2
- Method 2
- Sample 3
- Administration 4
- The Data 5

RESULTS

TEACHERS

- Introduction 6
- Background Information 6
- Availability of Instructional Television 8
- Utilization of ITV 17
- Typical Use of ITV Series 29
- Support of ITV 31
- Teachers' Preparation for Use of ITV 45
- Conditions Affecting the Use of ITV 46
- Comments on ITV 51
- Conclusion 60

LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS

- Introduction 61
- Background Information 61
- Availability of Instructional Television 64
- Support of ITV 76
- Utilization of ITV 81
- Library Media Specialists' Preparation for Use of ITV 95
- Reactions to Use of ITV 96
- Comments on ITV 109
- Conclusion 112

PRINCIPALS

- Introduction 113
- Background Information 113
- Availability of Instructional Television 115
- Support of ITV 125
- Principals' Preparation for Use of ITV 136
- Reactions to Use of ITV 137
- Comments on ITV 153
- Conclusion 154

RESULTS (continued)

ITV COORDINATORS

Introduction 155
Background Information 155
Budgetary Support 156
Availability of Instructional Television 157
Support for ITV 158
Overall Reactions Toward ITV 160
Comments on ITV 162
Conclusion 163

REFERENCES 164

APPENDICES

A. Survey Questionnaires
B. Survey Sample
C. Letter to Superintendents
D. Advance Letter to Principals
E. Cover Letter to Principals
F. Cover Letter to Library Media Specialists
G. Cover Letter to Teachers
H. Cover Letter to ITV Coordinators
I. Follow-up Letter

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A research project as large as the 1983-84 Maryland ITV Utilization Study is not possible without the help of a dedicated research team. I am deeply grateful to a large number of people who gave most unselfishly of their time, talents and energy. The project's assistant director, Ms. Ann B. O'Neill, supervised the staff, oversaw daily operations, edited the final draft, administered the budget and completed a host of other essential activities. She deserves a great deal of the credit for the successful completion of the project. Ms. Barbara Haase worked upon mailings, tabulation and key punching data. Her dedication and efficiency deserve the highest praise; we all agree that the study could not have been done without her. Dr. Robert B. Wall served as project consultant for sampling procedures and data analysis. His services were constant and essential to the project. He worked tirelessly and in the highest professional manner.

Towson State University students who worked upon data tabulation, mailings and the like include: Ms. Wendy S. Koch, Ms. L. Terese Heroux, and Ms. Pamela Smith. I also appreciate the support and help provided by Dr. Martha Cammarata of the Instructional Television Division of the Maryland State Department of Education. Additional support was supplied by Ms. Bertha Cornick and Ms. Linda Baker of the Office of Management and Information Systems, Maryland State Department of Education.

Special thanks go to the Department of Academic Computing, Towson State University, and Dr. Ron Blum. Special computing services were provided by Ms. Cheryl Frederick and Mr. Sean Devoy. I thank them for their patience and support.

Additional thanks are due to members of Towson State University's administrative staff including: Mr. John Suter, Office of Institutional Development; Ms. Bernadine Kreider, Office of Sponsored Research; Ms. Carole Gore and Ms. Robyn Reich, Budget Office - Grants and Scholarships.

To these, and to many others that I may have failed to mention, go my heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

RELATED STUDIES

A comprehensive national study regarding the utilization of television in the public schools was sponsored by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) in the 1976-1977 school year. The study was directed by Peter Dirr and Ron Pedone. The Dirr and Pedone study was representative of 12,000 school systems and 2,275,000 classrooms. The results indicated that instructional television was used by one out of every three teachers and that approximately fifteen million students received a regular portion of their instruction via television. While the results of this study were highly significant in terms of national usage, it provided limited benefits to assist in planning at the state level.

In order to provide more data specific to the utilization of instructional television within Maryland, the Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Television, sponsored a statewide survey in 1981. The first Maryland ITV study was directed by Kerry Johnson and Paul Keller and was modeled after the Dirr and Pedone study. Like the national study, the Johnson and Keller study collected survey data relevant to availability, commitment, actual use, and attitudes toward ITV. The Maryland study utilized data collection questionnaires which were modifications of the instruments used in the national study. Johnson and Keller found that utilization of ITV in Maryland closely followed national trends. For example, they found that ITV was widely available in Maryland and that 42.4% of teachers used ITV in 1981. Other findings indicated that ITV had become an accepted feature of instruction in Maryland public schools.

METHOD

The present study replicated the Johnson and Keller study in order to assess the current status of ITV utilization in the public schools of Maryland and to compare current usage with that of the 1980-81 school year. In order to obtain results which would be comparable with the 1981 study, it was decided to design questionnaires which would closely follow those of the 1981 study. Design of the instruments followed three principals: (1) they must closely match those used in the 1981 study in order to obtain useful comparable results; (2) they should include items to collect data relevant to current needs of MSDE; (3) they should be streamlined to ensure ease and accuracy of response. With those in mind we first determined what additional information was needed by MSDE and by ourselves and then designed items to collect such data.

Second, we reworked the instruments to ensure ease of response and to weed out ambiguous items. Effort was directed toward decreasing the time required to respond and toward improving accuracy of response. Since the 1981 study had not obtained usable data from school superintendents, it was decided that the instrument which had been used with them should be redesigned and sent to system ITV coordinators. It was felt that the system coordinators would more likely be the ones with the needed information and that they would be willing to participate in the study. The subsequent return rate among ITV coordinators (96%) proved these assumptions to be true.

Separate questionnaires were designed for teachers, library media specialists, principals, and ITV coordinators. The questionnaires were organized around the four major study questions: availability of ITV, commitment to ITV, actual use of ITV, and attitudes toward ITV. The prototype questionnaires underwent informal field testing to identify problem items and ease of response. After the initial field testing, it was decided to use professionally printed and color-coded questionnaires that would be attractive and easy to complete. Samples of the survey questionnaires are in Appendix A. The design of the questionnaires was greatly helped by the fact that the instruments used in the Johnson and Keller study were able to be updated and refined.

SAMPLE

The population of this study included all public schools in Maryland. We were interested in obtaining results which would ensure representation of all systems and proportional representation of elementary, middle, and high schools. Consequently, we employed a variation of stratified random sampling which yielded a sample of 209 Maryland public schools. The chart in Appendix B shows the number of elementary, middle, and high schools selected by system. In each school selected, instruments were to be completed by the principal, the library media specialist, and five classroom teachers, the latter randomly selected by the principal. In addition, the ITV coordinator for each public school system received an instrument. The final sample selected was comprised of 24 ITV coordinators, 209 principals, 209 library media specialists, and 1,045 teachers.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In November of 1983, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Instructional Television, requested that we undertake a study to determine the present usage of instructional television within the public schools of Maryland. One such study had been conducted by Johnson and Keller in 1981. Essentially, the proposed study would replicate and update the Johnson and Keller study. We were very pleased to conduct this study since, to a large extent, the objectives of the study coincided with our own interests in the utilization of television in Maryland public schools. In January of 1984, we prepared a proposal for the study which was subsequently approved by Maryland Instructional Television (MITV) and by the Council for Statewide Planning of Educational Information Systems (CSPEIS). The study was conducted during the spring of 1984. It was essentially a sample survey, utilizing mailed questionnaires. Data collection was completed for the project by late May in 1984 for all Maryland school systems except one.[1] Final data collection was completed by November 1984.

PURPOSE

The study's purpose was to determine the present usage of ITV in the public schools of Maryland. As with the Johnson and Keller study, data was collected relevant to four questions:

1. To what extent is ITV available in the Maryland public schools?
2. To what extent are teachers, principals, library media specialists and system ITV coordinators committed to the area of ITV?
3. To what extent is ITV actually used in Maryland public schools?
4. In general, what attitudes toward ITV are held by teachers, principals, library media specialists, and system ITV coordinators?

---

[1] One county (Montgomery) requested that data collection from principals and teachers be delayed until September 1984. Data collection from these individuals was completed by late November 1984.

ADMINISTRATION

In February of 1984, a letter was sent to each of the superintendents in the state explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their cooperation. This letter is included in Appendix C. The collection of data began with the mailing of letters to each school principal on April 13, 1984. The principals' letters explained the purposes of the study and detailed procedures which were to be followed when the questionnaires were mailed. Appendix D contains a copy of this letter. Questionnaire packets and letters to the 209 principals were mailed during May 2-9, 1984. Each packet sent to the principals contained a principal's questionnaire, a questionnaire for the library media specialist, and five questionnaires for classroom teachers. The packet included instructions for completing the questionnaires as well as the procedure to be followed in randomly selecting the classroom teachers. A sample of the cover letter to the principals for the questionnaire package is included in Appendix E. Cover letters accompanying library media specialist and teacher questionnaires are contained in Appendices F and G, respectively.

ITV coordinators received questionnaires and letters of explanation the week of May 17, 1984. Appendix H contains this letter.

In order to increase the response rate of the study, a follow-up letter was sent June 5-7, 1984, to all schools which had not responded. A sample of the follow-up letter is included in Appendix I. Telephone follow-ups of those remaining, including ITV coordinators, were conducted from June 6 to 20, 1984.[2] As a result of these procedures we obtained questionnaires as follows:

	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Returned	Questionnaires Returned (%)
System ITV Coordinators	24	23	95.8
Principals	209	166	79.4
Library Media Specialists	209	149	71.3
Classroom Teachers	1045	618	59.1
TOTAL	1487	956	64.3

---

[2] The schedule for Montgomery County principals and teachers was: questionnaire packet mailed - September 10; first follow-up - September 18; telephone follow-up - November 5.

THE DATA

Data for this study consists of responses of a sample of 618 classroom teachers, 149 library media specialists, 166 school principlas and 23 system ITV coordinators to their respective questionnaires. Copies of the survey questionnaires for each are included in Appendix A.

Analysis of the data consisted of categorization of responses by elementary, middle and high school levels. Percentages responding in each question category by level were calculated for each survey item. If a corresponding item existed from the 1980-81 study, the results are displayed adjacent to each other, and differences are noted. If no corresponding item exists, the results from this study are given and, in some cases, they are discussed.

TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

This, and the next three sections of the report, describe the data received on each item from classroom teachers, library media specialists, school principals and system ITV coordinators. Each item is stated as it appeared in the survey questionnaire, and it is followed by the percentage of persons responding in each category. This is followed by the data collected on the 1980-81 study so that the reader may view the current results and compare those with the Johnson and Keller study. If the results are very similar, no comment is usually made; if there are striking differences in the two studies, a comment related to the changes or differences is usually made. That procedure is followed in each of the sections which follow, except for data collected from the system ITV coordinators. Data collected from ITV coordinators in the present study is not comparable with data collected from superintendents in the Johnson and Keller study because in 1981 many superintendents delegated the questionnaires to others. We decided to use the system ITV coordinators as our universe, since there would be consistency in terms of the responsibilities of the respondents and because the ITV coordinators would be more likely to have specific knowledge related to systems' use of ITV.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Classroom teachers responding to the survey numbered 618 (59.1%). The number of teachers responding by types of schools are:

1983-84 STUDY	ELEMENTARY	62%
	MIDDLE	17%
	HIGH	21%
1980-81 STUDY	TYPE 1: ELEMENTARY	48%
	TYPE 2: MIDDLE/JUNIOR	24%
	TYPE 3: SENIOR HIGH	28%

As in the Johnson and Keller study, most of the teachers described their classroom setting as self-contained:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SELF-CONTAINED	68.5	73.4	76.4	70.6
NON-TRADITIONAL	18.8	11.7	3.6	15.5
OTHER	12.6	14.3	20.0	13.6

The number of students taught averaged sixty-six per teacher. However, the mode was twenty-eight and the median was forty. The average number of classes taught was three, with a mode of one.

Subjects taught by the teachers participating in the study varied:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALL ELEMENTARY	79.3	5.9	0.0	52.4
ART	1.1	3.9	1.8	1.9
CAREER/VOC. ED.	0.8	6.5	27.3	4.8
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	0.0	4.6	0.0	1.2
HOME EC.	0.0	2.0	3.6	0.9
INDUSTRIAL ED.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LANGUAGE ARTS	6.7	22.2	14.5	11.6
MATH	3.2	19.0	9.1	7.9
MUSIC	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.9
P.E./HEALTH ED.	0.3	7.2	1.8	2.2
READING	3.2	3.9	3.6	3.4
SCIENCE	0.0	6.5	10.9	2.8
SOCIAL STUDIES	0.0	9.8	16.4	4.1
SPECIAL EDUCATION	3.5	3.3	1.8	3.3
OTHER	1.9	2.0	9.1	2.6

When asked about their experience as educators, teachers responded as follows:

	ELEM.		MIDDLE		HIGH		TOTAL	
	Present School	Overall	Present School	Overall	Present School	Overall	Present School	Overall
1 YEAR	9.6	1.3	10.5	6.9	11.3	5.3	10.0	3.1
2-3 YEARS	12.6	4.2	16.3	3.8	11.3	2.6	13.5	4.0
4-6 YEARS	19.7	12.9	24.8	8.5	18.9	13.2	21.0	11.7
7-9 YEARS	14.9	11.9	17.0	13.8	13.2	2.6	15.3	11.7
10+ YEARS	43.3	69.7	31.4	66.9	45.3	76.3	40.2	69.5

AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

#6. YEARS USED INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	12.0	43.0	50.0	23.7
ONE	12.6	11.4	11.1	12.1
TWO	13.9	9.4	13.0	12.7
THREE OR MORE	61.5	36.2	25.9	51.5
USING THIS YEAR	54.4	30.1	38.8	46.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	13.3	42.9	59.9	33.4
ONE	8.5	12.3	10.4	9.9
TWO	13.3	17.2	6.8	12.4
THREE OR MORE	64.8	27.6	22.9	44.2

#7. AVAILABILITY OF ITV PROGRAMMING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	92.6	81.3	84.0	89.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	91.0	86.2	72.8	84.9

#8. AVAILABILITY OF TELEVISION SETS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	4.9	7.4	7.3	5.8
BLACK AND WHITE	23.8	13.5	18.8	18.8
COLOR	59.0	62.2	58.2	59.8
BOTH	12.3	16.9	34.5	15.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	4.0	10.1	15.5	8.6
BLACK AND WHITE	37.2	36.7	28.9	34.8
COLOR	44.2	32.9	32.1	38.2
BOTH	14.6	20.3	23.5	18.4

The area which shows the greatest change is the increase in the number of color television sets. Color sets have increased in each type of school from an overall of 38.2% in 1981 to 59.8% today.

#9. TELEVISION MEDIA AVAILABLE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ON-AIR	73.9	56.3	56.9	67.7
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	49.9	63.9	76.5	56.0
CABLE TV	15.9	12.5	7.8	14.2
VIDEODISC	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.4
CLOSED CIRCUIT	11.0	16.0	15.7	12.8
DON'T KNOW	11.0	16.7	15.7	13.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ON-AIR	78.9	59.7	54.0	67.7
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	25.8	63.3	58.4	43.3
CABLE TV	8.1	7.2	7.5	7.7
VIDEODISC	1.3	2.9	3.1	2.2
CLOSED CIRCUIT	16.8	25.2	27.3	21.6
DON'T KNOW	10.7	16.5	19.3	14.4

Most availability categories show little change since 1981. However, there is an increase in the availability of videotape/cassette equipment at the elementary level, from 25.8% in 1981 to 49.9% today. The high school teachers also reported an increase in videotape/cassette equipment, from 58.4% in 1981 to 76.5% today.

#10. ACCESS TO TELEVISION SETS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
EASY	60.8	44.2	38.9	54.4
PRETTY EASY	27.9	28.6	40.7	29.3
SOMETIMES CAN'T	6.0	13.6	11.1	8.5
OFTEN CAN'T	5.2	13.6	9.3	7.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
EASY	68.9	50.7	42.9	57.9
PRETTY EASY	20.2	33.3	31.7	26.3
SOMETIMES CAN'T	6.7	8.3	12.4	8.6
OFTEN CAN'T	4.2	7.6	13.0	7.3

Access to TV sets continues to be easier for elementary teachers than for middle or high school teachers. There appears to be little change since the 1981 study.

#11. LOCATION OF TELEVISION SETS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
IN MY CLASS	40.8	16.8	14.8	32.0
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	31.5	54.4	59.3	40.1
BROUGHT FROM NEARBY CLASS	13.0	16.8	16.7	14.4
GO TO NEARBY CLASS	7.9	5.4	3.7	6.8
BROUGHT FROM CENTRAL LOCATION	23.1	19.5	31.5	22.9
GO TO CENTRAL LOCATION	1.9	4.0	0.0	2.3
USED WITH MICROCOMPUTER	1.1	2.0	0.0	1.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
IN MY CLASS	42.6	19.3	10.6	28.6
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	24.0	56.0	68.8	43.5
BROUGHT FROM NEARBY CLASS	16.1	13.3	7.6	13.2
GO TO NEARBY CLASS	8.2	6.7	1.8	6.1
BROUGHT FROM CENTRAL LOCATION	28.7	27.3	21.2	26.4
GO TO CENTRAL LOCATION	3.8	6.0	7.1	5.2

Locations of TV sets remain much as they were in 1981. No significant conflict of use with microcomputers was reported.

#12. TV MONITOR CONFLICTS BETWEEN ITV USAGE AND MICROCOMPUTER USAGE

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DAILY	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.6
1 PER WEEK	0.6	1.5	3.9	1.2
1 PER MONTH	0.3	1.5	0.0	0.6
1 PER SEMESTER	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0
RARELY	14.7	11.9	11.8	13.6
NEVER	84.1	83.7	84.3	84.0

There are very few conflicts reported between TV monitors used for microcomputers and those used for ITV.

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#13. LOCATION OF MICROCOMPUTERS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MATH/SCIENCE CLASSES	6.9	45.2	60.9	23.7
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	45.6	23.7	15.2	36.0
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES	8.0	4.4	4.3	6.6
OTHER	39.4	26.7	19.6	33.6

Locations of microcomputers appear to be related to the school level. There is a tendency for microcomputers to be located in math or science classrooms more frequently at the high school level, while in the elementary schools they are most often located in the library media center. Other locations were reported by 33.6% of the sample.

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#14. HOW OFTEN ARE SETS IN GOOD REPAIR?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	25.2	25.9	31.5	26.0
MOST OF THE TIME	63.9	56.5	63.0	61.8
SOME OF THE TIME	8.4	10.2	1.9	8.2
SELDOM	2.5	7.5	3.7	3.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	35.7	36.2	28.7	34.2
MOST OF THE TIME	54.8	53.4	58.1	55.3
SOME OF THE TIME	5.1	8.8	8.1	6.8
SELDOM	4.5	0.7	5.0	3.7

#15. QUALITY OF TELEVISION RECEPTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	53.5	58.0	64.7	55.7
FAIR	38.9	29.4	27.5	35.4
POOR	7.6	11.9	7.8	8.7

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	63.4	70.3	52.7	62.3
FAIR	29.4	22.5	34.0	29.0
POOR	7.1	7.2	13.3	8.7

Results are consistent with those reported in 1981.

#16. TELEVISION-RELATED SERVICES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
RECORD/PLAYBOOK	73.7	81.8	88.2	77.4
EARPHONES	11.2	12.9	13.7	11.9
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	26.3	16.7	21.6	23.2
TV STUDIO	5.9	9.8	15.7	8.0
TAPE LIBRARY IN SCHOOL	18.8	24.2	41.2	22.6
TAPE LIBRARY IN SYSTEM	36.5	44.7	49.0	40.0
SOMEONE TO RECORD	46.1	50.8	62.7	49.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
RECORD/PLAYBACK	55.9	86.6	85.5	73.1
EARPHONES	14.1	13.4	13.8	13.8
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	39.0	30.6	34.3	32.3
TV STUDIO	6.6	20.1	27.0	16.4
TAPE LIBRARY IN SCHOOL	17.4	31.3	36.8	27.1
TAPE LIBRARY IN SYSTEM	19.7	18.7	27.0	21.6
SOMEONE TO RECORD	38.0	59.0	48.7	46.9

Elementary teachers reported an increase in the availability of equipment to record and playback programs, from 55.9% in 1981 to 73.7% today. There was also an increase in those reporting the availability of a videotape library in the system, from 21.6% in 1981 to 40.0% today.

#17. HOW OFTEN ARE PROGRAMS PRE-RECORDED?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	4.0	12.7	15.1	7.3
MOST OF TIME	5.4	12.7	9.4	7.7
SOME OF TIME	14.0	7.7	11.3	12.1
SELDOM	28.8	14.8	11.3	23.4
NOT APPLICABLE	47.6	52.1	52.8	49.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	5.5	16.7	19.9	11.9
MOST OF TIME	6.2	20.1	14.9	11.8
SOME OF TIME	10.7	14.6	7.5	10.8
SELDOM	22.5	5.6	10.6	15.4
NOT APPLICABLE	55.0	43.1	47.2	50.2

While almost half of the teachers reported that someone is available for recording ITV programs for later playback, most do not report using that service.

#18. EASE OF ARRANGING RECORDING/PLAYBACK

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
EASY	17.7	20.7	22.6	19.0
PRETTY EASY	22.7	28.0	28.3	24.6
SOMETIMES CAN'T	9.1	10.7	13.2	9.9
NOT EASY	8.9	6.0	7.5	8.0
NEVER TRIED	28.3	24.7	20.8	26.0
NO FACILITIES	13.3	10.0	7.5	11.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
EASY	11.7	27.2	27.0	19.5
PRETTY EASY	13.3	29.3	20.1	19.0
SOMETIMES CAN'T	5.0	6.1	11.9	7.1
NOT EASY	7.7	8.2	10.1	8.4
NEVER TRIED	30.7	21.8	22.0	26.2
NO FACILITIES	31.7	7.5	8.8	19.8

Reported ease of videotape recording or playback is consistent with the results of 1981.

#19. DIFFICULTIES THAT AFFECT ITV USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SET AVAILABILITY	10.4	25.4	16.0	14.8
SET QUALITY	10.7	4.9	6.0	8.7
SET IN CLASS	4.0	1.4	4.0	3.3
SET MAINTENANCE	4.6	3.5	0.0	3.9
PROGRAM SCHEDULING	47.0	29.6	20.0	39.9
ADV. PROGRAM NOTICE	6.1	15.5	16.0	9.5
PROGRAM QUALITY	1.7	2.1	6.0	2.2
AVAIL. ASSISTANCE	.9	.7	4.0	1.1
ENOUGH PLANNING TIME	7.8	3.5	10.0	6.9
SCH./GUIDE AVAILABILITY	1.7	4.2	6.0	2.8
OTHERS	5.2	9.2	12.0	6.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
SET AVAILABILITY	16.2	12.9	23.4	17.3
SET QUALITY	14.4	11.5	14.5	13.7
SET IN CLASS	7.4	14.4	15.9	11.3
SET MAINTENANCE	5.6	10.1	9.0	7.6
PROGRAM SCHEDULING	65.1	46.8	44.8	55.5
ADV. PROGRAM NOTICE	17.6	46.0	46.9	32.0
PROGRAM QUALITY	5.3	14.4	15.9	10.2
AVAIL. ASSISTANCE	1.8	12.2	8.3	6.0
ENOUGH PLANNING TIME	29.9	31.7	40.7	33.1
SCH./GUIDES AVAILABILITY	13.4	27.3	31.0	14.6
OTHER	13.0	18.7	13.8	14.6

Program scheduling has decreased as a reported difficulty from 55.5% in 1981 to 39.9% today. The decrease was most noticeable at the elementary level, from 65.1% to 47.0%.

UTILIZATION OF ITV

#20. VIEWING ARRANGEMENTS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
WITH ANOTHER CLASS	80.6	73.7	70.9	77.9
WHOLE CLASS ALONE	78.4	68.4	69.1	74.9
SMALL GROUPS	27.0	13.8	21.8	23.0
INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	18.9	8.6	10.9	15.4
NEVER USE ITV	25.1	41.4	45.5	31.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
WITH ANOTHER CLASS	38.8	25.5	9.6	27.9
WHOLE CLASS ALONE	65.4	51.7	39.2	55.2
SMALL GROUPS	13.5	10.1	11.4	12.1
INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	3.5	3.4	5.4	4.0
NEVER USE ITV	16.7	36.9	52.4	30.9

There has been an increase in the number of classes that share or view ITV programs with another class since the 1980-81 study.

#21. AVERAGE AMOUNT OF ITV USED PER WEEK

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	41.1	58.7	56.6	47.2
1/4 HOUR	15.8	19.3	17.0	16.8
1/2 HOUR	17.4	8.0	9.4	14.2
1 HOUR	18.0	5.3	9.4	13.9
1-1/2 HOURS	4.6	2.0	1.9	3.7
2 HOURS	1.4	3.3	3.8	2.1
3 HOURS	0.8	1.3	0.0	0.9
4 HOURS	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.5
5 OR MORE HOURS	0.3	1.3	1.9	0.7

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	37.9	59.4	69.2	51.3
1/4 HOUR	12.4	15.5	11.0	12.8
1/2 HOUR	22.0	9.0	2.9	13.9
1 HOUR	14.0	5.8	5.8	9.9
1-1/2 HOURS	4.3	1.9	1.2	2.9
2 HOURS	4.0	1.9	1.2	2.8
3 HOURS	2.5	2.6	0.6	2.0
4 HOURS	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.5
5 OR MORE HOURS	2.8	3.9	6.4	4.0

52.8% of all teachers reported watching at least 1/4 hour of ITV each week. 58.9% of elementary, 41.3% of middle and 43.4% of high school teachers reported watching at least 1/4 hour each week.

#22. MEDIA FORMATS USED

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
AUDIO	16.0	22.4	13.2	17.5
COMPUTER	16.8	15.2	15.1	16.3
GAMES & SIMULATIONS	17.0	10.4	7.5	14.4
ITV	44.3	34.0	40.7	41.3
FILM	58.4	64.4	50.2	59.2
SILENT SLIDE/ F STRIP	33.1	19.0	29.1	30.0
SOUND SLIDE/ F STRIP	80.0	65.2	75.5	76.6
TRANSPARENCIES	34.0	61.4	64.1	43.0
OTHER	1.0	8.1	4.5	3.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
AUDIO	18.2	20.7	17.5	18.6
COMPUTER	0.6	5.3	5.3	3.0
GAMES & SIMULATIONS	16.9	18.0	7.0	14.5
ITV	41.4	23.3	17.5	30.7
FILM	57.3	48.0	56.7	55.0
SILENT SLIDE/ F STRIP	38.2	28.7	31.6	34.2
SOUND SLIDE/ F STRIP	72.9	59.3	66.7	68.0
TRANSPARENCIES	38.9	56.0	56.7	47.7
OTHER	3.5	6.7	6.4	5.0

#23. TIME USING NON-PRINT MEDIA (PER WEEK)

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
HOURS				
0	1.2	3.5	0.0	1.7
1	24.9	34.2	40.9	28.6
2	33.9	19.7	15.9	28.7
3	16.8	10.3	20.5	14.9
4	6.2	9.4	0.0	6.3
5	7.4	11.1	13.6	8.9
6	2.3	1.7	2.3	2.1
7	1.9	0.0	2.3	0.6
8	0.6	1.8	0.0	0.8
9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.4
10	2.9	6.0	0.0	3.4
10+	1.9	2.7	4.5	2.3

1980-81 STUDY

HOURS	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
0	5.3	10.8	13.7	9.1
1	30.7	20.4	28.6	27.5
2	24.7	17.2	14.8	20.0
3	14.0	10.8	8.8	11.7
4	5.0	7.0	2.2	4.7
5	11.0	15.3	18.1	14.1
6	1.7	3.2	2.2	2.2
7	0.7	1.3	0.0	0.6
8	1.0	1.9	0.5	1.1
9	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.3
10	3.3	5.1	4.9	4.2
10+	2.3	7.0	5.4	4.4

#24. No data report.

#25. OPTIMUM AMOUNT OF ITV TIME (PER WEEK)

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	5.6	7.1	9.3	6.4
1/4 HOUR	5.6	11.4	1.9	6.7
1/2 HOUR	15.8	11.4	13.0	14.4
1 HOUR	31.5	17.1	38.9	28.6
1-1/2 HOURS	11.3	7.9	9.3	10.2
2 HOURS	19.4	21.4	13.0	19.3
3 HOURS	5.6	9.3	7.4	6.7
4 HOURS	3.7	2.9	1.9	3.3
5 HOURS OR MORE	1.4	11.4	5.6	4.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	3.1	10.0	10.2	6.7
1/4 HOUR	2.2	3.8	3.2	2.8
1/2 HOUR	9.9	13.7	12.3	11.5
1 HOUR	36.4	21.2	29.9	31.0
1-1/2 HOURS	13.6	7.5	3.7	9.4
2 HOURS	17.6	16.2	15.0	16.5
3 HOURS	11.7	10.6	8.0	10.4
4 HOURS	2.5	5.6	4.8	3.9
5 HOURS OR MORE	3.1	11.2	12.8	7.7

#26. ANYBODY USED ITV TOO MUCH?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
YES	9.8	12.7	15.1	11.0
NO	90.2	87.3	84.9	88.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
YES	16.6	8.6	8.5	12.4
NO	83.4	91.4	91.5	87.6

#27. MAXIMUM APPROPRIATE TIME FOR ITV (PER WEEK)

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1/4 HOUR	1.9	2.8	1.9	2.2
1/2 HOUR	9.7	22.5	13.2	13.3
1 HOUR	34.4	29.6	35.8	33.3
1-1/2 HOURS	20.8	11.3	17.0	18.0
2-4 HOURS	24.7	21.1	20.8	23.4
5 HOURS OR MORE	2.2	4.2	3.8	2.9
NO SET LIMIT	6.1	8.5	7.5	6.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
1/4 HOUR	0.9	3.2	4.3	2.4
1/2 HOUR	9.5	21.0	11.4	12.7
1 HOUR	26.8	31.2	40.5	31.7
1-1/2 HOURS	27.4	13.4	10.8	19.4
2-4 HOURS	27.4	17.8	16.8	22.2
5 HOURS OR MORE	3.2	2.5	2.2	2.7
NO SET LIMIT	4.7	10.8	14.1	8.8

#28. ITV OUTCOMES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
EXPANDED KNOWLEDGE	52.3	39.8	41.7	48.3
EXPANDED VOCAB.	43.5	28.2	19.4	37.7
FOLLOW-UP IDEAS	50.5	34.0	36.1	45.3
MORE ENTHUSIASTIC	16.3	27.2	16.7	19.0
USE LIBRARY MORE	15.2	8.7	8.3	13.0
MORE ITV AT HOME	31.1	14.6	22.2	26.3
CALMING EFFECT	40.3	54.4	25.0	42.4
OTHER	8.5	16.5	16.7	11.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
EXPANDED KNOWLEDGE	51.1	41.7	52.2	49.2
EXPANDED VOCAB.	46.6	21.4	22.8	36.1
FOLLOW-UP IDEAS	57.6	47.6	40.2	51.9
MORE ENTHUSIASTIC	22.9	21.4	26.1	23.2
USE LIBRARY MORE	22.9	9.7	8.7	17.1
MORE ITV AT HOME	28.6	24.3	26.1	27.1
CALMING EFFECT	45.8	52.4	42.4	46.6
OTHER	1.1	4.9	10.9	3.9

The outcomes reported in 1981 correspond closely to those reported in the present study.

#29. TYPE OF STUDENT FOR WHOM ITV IS USEFUL

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALL	81.4	76.4	69.8	79.0
BELOW AVERAGE	4.3	7.9	7.5	5.5
AVERAGE	6.6	6.4	9.4	6.8
ABOVE AVERAGE	4.6	3.6	3.8	4.2
SPECIAL	0.6	1.4	5.7	1.3
NOT USEFUL FOR ANY	1.1	1.4	0.0	1.1
OTHER	1.4	2.9	3.8	2.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALL	81.7	65.6	66.1	73.6
BELOW AVERAGE	6.1	9.9	8.8	7.7
AVERAGE	8.0	7.3	6.4	7.4
ABOVE AVERAGE	1.6	6.6	7.0	4.3
SPECIAL	0.0	6.0	5.8	3.0
NOT USEFUL FOR ANY	1.6	2.6	4.1	2.5
OTHER	1.0	2.0	1.8	1.4

Results correspond to those of 1981. Most teachers continue to feel that ITV is useful for all students.

#30. USE OF AN ITV SERIES/PROGRAM

	ITV Series	ITV Program	Both
PAST WEEK	15.1	3.0	4.6
PAST MONTH	14.4	6.2	5.7
PAST YEAR	19.0	7.1	8.7
NOT THIS YEAR	9.0	2.9	9.4
NEVER USED	2.5	0.6	16.0
WILL USE	4.8	2.9	3.8

No data was reported for this item in the 1980-81 study.

#31. NUMBER OF SERIES USED THIS YEAR

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	46.4	76.6	70.9	56.7
1 SERIES	16.9	10.6	12.7	14.9
2 SERIES	17.5	8.5	9.1	14.3
3 SERIES	9.7	1.4	7.3	7.3
4 SERIES	4.6	2.1	0.0	3.5
5 SERIES	4.9	0.7	0.0	3.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NONE	49.2	79.4	86.0	66.3
1 SERIES	18.0	11.6	10.1	14.3
2 SERIES	13.3	5.2	2.8	8.5
3 SERIES	9.6	3.2	0.6	5.6
4 SERIES	5.9	0.6	0.6	3.2
5 SERIES OR MORE	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.0

One or more ITV series are reported to be used on a regular basis by 43.3% of all teachers. Elementary teachers are the heavier users, with 53.6% reporting that they use one or more series regularly. Those reporting no use decreased from 66.3% in 1981 to 56.7% today.

#32. ITV SERIES RATINGS

Ratings are based on a 5-point scale: 5 = excellent; 1 = poor.

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH		RATING FREQUENCY		
	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Elem.	Mid.	High
ART									
1. Art Cart (The)	3.75	4.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4	1	0
2. Primary Art	3.6	3.6	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6	1	0

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH		RATING FREQUENCY		
	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Elem.	Mid.	High
CAREER EDUCATION									
3. Jobs: Seeking, Finding, Keeping	3.6	3.3	3.76	4.14	4.2	4.4	5	13	10
CONSUMER EDUCATION									
4. Consumer Connection	3.6	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3	2	2
5. Consumer Squad	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4	6	4
ECONOMIC EDUCATION									
6. Give and Take	4.3	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3	4	2
7. Trade-Offs	4.5	4.25	3.66	5.0	4.0	0.0	6	3	1
ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION									
8. Terra: Our World	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.66	4.5	5.0	16	5	2
HEALTH EDUCATION									
9. All About You	4.42	4.21	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	49	2	0
10. Inside Story With Slim Goodbody (The)	4.7	4.32	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37	2	0
11. Jackson Junior High	4.71	4.25	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	7	3	0
12. Mulligan Stew	4.25	4.0	3.66	3.0	5.0	0.0	28	3	2
13. On the Level	4.6	4.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1	-
LANGUAGE ARTS									
14. Media Machine (The)	3.5	4.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	2	1	2
15. Stories Without Words	3.4	4.17	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	29	2	1
16. Write Channel (The)	3.12	3.0	3.6	3.33	5.0	3.0	31	5	1
17. Young Filmmakers (The)	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	6	1	1

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH		RATING FREQUENCY		
	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Elem.	Mid.	High
MATHEMATICS									
18. Adventure of the Mind	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	3	2	0
19. Counterplot	4.5	4.0	4.16	4.4	0.0	0.0	4	6	0
20. It Figures	3.8	3.42	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21	1	0
21. Landscape of Geometry	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0	0
22. Mathematical Relationships	4.11	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9	0	0
23. Mathways	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	6	1	0
24. Numbers Game II	4.18	3.85	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	1	0
MUSIC									
25. Let's All Sing	4.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	8	0	0
26. Music and Me	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	0	0
27. Song Bag	3.86	3.41	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23	0	0
READING									
28. Book, Look, and Listen	4.5	3.77	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	58	0	0
29. Contract!	4.5	0.0	4.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	2	6	0
30. From the Brothers Grimm	4.4	3.81	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32	1	0
31. Once Upon a Town	4.1	3.89	4.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	30	2	-
32. Read All About It! I	4.51	4.33	4.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0	5	0
33. Readers' Cube	4.14	4.25	4.62	4.5	0.0	0.0	7	8	0
34. Readalong	4.14	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26	0	0
35. Readers' Guide	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	0	0
36. Readit	4.95	4.25	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	24	1	-

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH		RATING FREQUENCY		
	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Elem.	Mid.	High
SAFETY EDUCATION									
37. Afloat and Aboat	4.5	4.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16	0	0
38. 'Way to Go	4.25	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20	0	0
SCIENCE									
39. Bioscope	4.33	3.14	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	9	1	1
40. Community of Living Things (The)	4.47	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	17	1	2
41. Dimensions in Science: Chemistry	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	1	0
42. Dimensions in Science: Physics	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	1	0
43. Exploring the World of Science	4.39	3.07	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	46	1	-
44. Many Worlds of Nature (The)	4.35	3.77	3.5	0.0	4.0	4.0	20	2	2
45. Real World of Insects (The)	4.69	3.9	4.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	23	2	1
46. Up Close and Natural	4.61	4.54	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21	0	0
47. Universe and I	4.0	2.5	4.33	5.0	0.0	0.0	4	3	0
SOCIAL STUDIES									
48. Across Cultures	4.14	3.75	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	1	-
49. American Scrapbook	4.41	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	17	3	2
50. Assignment: The World	4.69	3.33	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	13	4	2
51. By the People	0.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	0	1	1
52. Comparative Geography	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	10	2	0

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH		RATING FREQUENCY		
	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Series Rating	Guide Rating	Elem.	Mid.	High
53. Finding Our Way	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	8	2	0
54. Here and There in Maryland	4.61	4.46	4.66	4.5	0.0	0.0	54	0	0
55. Maryland ...	4.55	4.19	4.66	4.66	3.0	0.0	43	3	1
56. Ripples	4.14	3.36	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21	0	0
57. Truly American	4.55	4.71	3.75	4.0	0.0	0.0	34	0	0
58. Under the Blue Umbrella	4.52	4.15	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	23	0	1
59. Under the Yellow Balloon	4.56	4.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY									
60. General Educational Development	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
SPECIALS									
61. Interludes	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0
62. Special Programming Hour	3.8	3.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4	1	0
63. State Education Events (SEE) Board	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	1	0
64. Teleconferences	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	1	0
INSERVICE EDUCATION									
65. Interaction: Human Concerns in the School	3.3	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	1	0
66. Teaching Students with Special Needs (Secondary Level)	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0	3	0
67. Teaching Writing: A Process Approach	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.7	3.5	4.0	6	5	2

#33. ITV SCHEDULE INFORMATION

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MONITOR	11.8	5.7	2.5	9.4
CATALOG/SCHEDULE	80.9	55.5	45.0	71.4
SEE BOARD	1.7	2.8	0.0	1.8
OTHER	6.9	18.9	25.0	11.5
DIFFICULTY	12.5	30.2	32.5	18.7

Most teachers get information on the ITV broadcast schedule through the MITV Catalog/Schedule. Elementary teachers appear to have less difficulty than middle or high school teachers in obtaining information about the broadcast schedule.

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

TYPICAL USE OF ITV SERIES

Responses to items 34-36 are based upon a named series. Percentages are based upon the 294 teachers (219 elementary, 55 middle and 20 high) who named a series.

#34. METHODS OF USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USED BEFORE	81.7	69.6	61.1	78.2
PREVIEWED	35.9	65.2	56.3	43.2
READ GUIDE	83.5	71.1	66.7	80.2
USED GUIDE	69.8	63.6	41.7	67.2
USED SERIES AS KEY	34.6	40.5	20.0	35.0
USED AS SUPPLEMENT	91.1	87.2	82.4	89.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
USED BEFORE	77.8	69.2	57.9	72.5
PREVIEWED	33.5	63.9	71.1	44.4
READ GUIDE	75.7	64.1	64.9	72.2
USED GUIDE	66.7	56.8	55.9	63.5
USED SERIES AS KEY	29.5	24.2	29.4	28.7
USED AS SUPPLEMENT	89.5	86.0	73.5	86.7

#35. DISCUSSION BEFORE VIEWING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NO TIME	16.2	18.5	30.0	17.6
UP TO 10 MIN.	62.2	48.1	45.0	58.4
10 TO 15 MIN.	18.0	18.5	10.0	17.6
MORE THAN 15	3.6	14.8	15.0	6.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NO TIME	17.3	6.4	15.9	15.2
UP TO 10 MIN.	56.8	53.2	25.0	51.1
10 to 15 MIN.	22.7	23.4	27.3	23.6
MORE THAN 15	3.2	17.0	31.8	10.0

#36. DISCUSSION AFTER VIEWING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
NO TIME	2.8	14.8	20.0	6.2
UP TO 10 MIN.	45.8	27.8	30.0	41.4
10 TO 15 MIN.	36.6	35.2	30.0	35.9
MORE THAN 15 MIN.	9.3	11.1	10.0	9.7

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
NO TIME	1.7	2.1	11.4	3.3
UP TO 10 MIN.	46.4	29.8	15.9	38.6
10 TO 15 MIN.	38.1	40.4	25.0	36.4
MORE THAN 15 MIN.	13.8	27.7	47.7	21.7

#37. PROGRAM NEEDS DURING NEXT THREE YERAS

	Subject Areas:	Number Suggesting At: Elementary	Middle	High
1.	Art	25	4	2
2.	Career/Voc. Ed.	9	6	17
3.	Foreign Language	5	1	6
4.	Home Economics	1	1	6
5.	Industrial Education	0	1	1
6.	Language Arts	94	21	12
7.	Math	98	15	15
8.	Music	14	4	1
9.	Physical Education	20	3	9
10.	Reading	104	14	10
11.	Science	132	13	8
12.	Social Studies	124	15	15
13.	Special Education	6	6	7
14.	Other	25	3	8

No data was reported for this item in the 1980-81 study.

SUPPORT OF ITV

#38. TEACHER GUIDES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ARE AVAILABLE	30.0	38.5	38.1	32.0
ARE USEFUL	69.5	61.5	61.9	67.7

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ARE AVAILABLE	70.3	57.9	41.1	60.0
ARE USEFUL	86.6	76.7	63.3	80.4

There has been a decline in the percentage of teachers reporting that teacher guides are available, especially at the elementary level.

#39. HOW OFTEN DO TEACHERS USE THE GUIDES?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	17.1	12.4	6.1	14.9
USUALLY	26.8	16.5	10.2	22.6
SOMETIMES	18.4	16.5	12.2	17.3
A FEW TIMES	14.0	13.2	20.4	14.5
NOT AT ALL	23.7	41.3	51.0	30.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	18.5	13.4	8.9	14.7
USUALLY	24.5	15.7	10.1	18.5
SOMETIMES	19.2	10.4	7.6	14.0
A FEW TIMES	15.0	12.7	7.0	12.3
NOT AT ALL	22.7	47.8	65.8	40.3

The use of guides to plan instruction closely parallels results of 1981.

#40. TEACHER GUIDE DISTRIBUTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL	22.0	12.6	2.0	17.9
GIVEN ON REQUEST	28.7	23.6	20.4	26.7
NOT PROVIDED	3.2	8.7	16.3	5.8
COPIES IN SCHOOL	25.2	14.2	18.4	21.9
DON'T KNOW	20.9	40.9	42.9	27.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL	19.1	10.7	9.7	14.6
GIVEN ON REQUEST	38.2	20.1	13.7	27.3
NOT PROVIDED	3.2	4.0	8.0	4.7
COPIES IN SCHOOL	19.1	17.4	14.9	17.6
DON'T KNOW	20.4	47.7	53.1	35.7

#41. AWARENESS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMING

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SPECIAL PROGRAMMING HOUR	12.3	10.1	8.0	11.3
SEE BOARD	8.3	7.4	4.3	7.7

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#42. BUILDING ITV COORDINATOR

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	19.5	24.6	14.6	20.4
PART TIME	14.3	8.2	14.6	12.8
INFORMAL	31.8	15.7	18.8	26.5
NONE	34.4	51.5	52.1	40.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	27.1	26.5	24.5	26.3
PART TIME	5.6	12.9	14.8	9.8
INFORMAL	31.4	25.9	14.2	25.6
NONE	36.0	34.7	46.5	38.3

The number of schools with ITV coordinators corresponds closely to the results of the 1981 study. Only 4.3% of teachers responding reported that they are the ITV building coordinator.

#43. BUILDING ITV COORDINATOR SERVICES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DIST. GUIDES/SCH.	3.2	4.8	0.0	2.6
PROVIDES NEWS-LETTER	25.8	52.4	42.3	38.5
CALLS ATTENTION TO PROGRAMS	38.7	33.3	53.8	42.3
PROVIDES EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE	74.2	66.7	80.8	74.4
PROVIDES TRAINING/ CONSULTATION	19.4	9.5	23.1	17.9
WORKS WITH STUDENTS	16.1	19.0	11.5	15.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
DIST. GUIDES/SCH.	94.4	58.9	50.6	75.0
PROVIDES NEWS-LETTER	20.3	15.6	16.0	18.1
CALLS ATTENTION TO SPECIAL PROGRAMS	35.0	40.0	35.8	36.5
PROVIDES EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE	53.1	81.1	86.5	68.1
PROVIDES TRAINING/ CONSULTATION	9.6	26.7	32.1	19.3
WORKS WITH STUDENTS	14.7	24.4	21.0	18.7

Very few building ITV coordinators were reported to distribute guides and schedules while it was an ordinary practice in 1980-81. Most frequently, they were reported to provide equipment assistance, to provide a newsletter,and to call attention to special programs.

#44. CONTACT WITH OUTSIDE ITV PERSONNEL

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
CONTACTED	2.4	4.4	2.1	2.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
CONTACTED	4.4	3.2	5.5	4.4
IF YES--SYSTEM				
VISITED SCHOOL	28.6	66.7	20.0	33.3
PROVIDED IN-SERVICE	42.9	33.3	60.0	46.7
PROVIDED MATERIALS	42.9	66.7	0.0	33.3

In the current study of those teachers saying they had been contacted, only eight reported the nature of the contact. Of those, all reported that their school had been visited by either the school system ITV coordinator or by someone from the ITV Division.

#45. BUILDING ADMINISTRATION'S PRACTICE TOWARDS ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	3.2	4.5	9.4	4.1
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	32.9	24.8	30.2	30.6
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	61.4	69.9	58.5	63.2
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	1.7	0.0	1.9	1.3
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.9	0.8	0.0	0.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	4.4	4.1	1.8	3.6
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	36.0	30.3	24.0	31.4
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	55.2	63.4	71.9	61.6
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	3.2	2.1	1.8	2.5
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.8

#46. GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD ITV

A. CHAIRS/SUBJECT SPECIALISTS:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	36.3	45.4	43.1	39.6
NEUTRAL	63.0	53.8	56.9	59.7
AGAINST	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	40.8	39.7	40.3	40.3
NEUTRAL	57.8	56.5	58.3	57.6
AGAINST	1.4	3.8	1.4	2.1

B. OTHER TEACHERS:	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY				
FAVOR	53.0	40.6	40.0	48.5
NEUTRAL	45.1	59.4	60.0	50.3
AGAINST	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.2
1980-81 STUDY				
FAVOR	52.6	32.1	33.3	42.7
NEUTRAL	47.1	62.7	66.0	55.8
AGAINST	0.3	5.2	0.6	1.5

C. LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	68.4	64.8	64.6	67.1
NEUTRAL	31.0	33.6	35.4	32.1
AGAINST	0.6	1.6	0.0	0.8
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	65.9	63.5	58.4	63.4
NEUTRAL	33.8	36.5	40.3	36.1
AGAINST	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.5

D. OTHER SPECIALISTS:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	28.1	37.7	31.9	31.2
NEUTRAL	70.8	61.5	68.1	67.9
AGAINST	1.1	0.8	0.0	0.9
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	32.7	27.5	27.1	29.9
NEUTRAL	66.5	71.0	71.5	69.0
AGAINST	0.8	1.5	1.4	1.1

E. PARENTS:	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	26.3	20.2	18.8	24.0
NEUTRAL	68.0	72.3	79.2	70.2
AGAINST	5.7	7.6	2.1	5.8
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	30.6	18.0	17.2	24.2
NEUTRAL	65.5	78.2	80.7	72.5
AGAINST	3.9	3.8	2.1	3.4

F. STUDENTS:	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	74.7	57.0	51.0	68.1
NEUTRAL	25.3	42.1	49.0	31.7
AGAINST	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.2
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	73.8	53.1	47.7	62.3
NEUTRAL	26.2	46.9	50.3	37.2
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5

G. SYSTEM OFFICE:	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	42.0	38.8	36.2	40.6
NEUTRAL	56.3	57.9	61.7	57.3
AGAINST	1.7	3.3	2.1	2.1
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	39.3	26.0	30.6	33.6
NEUTRAL	59.5	73.2	66.7	64.9
AGAINST	1.2	0.8	2.7	1.5

#47. IDEAS FROM DIFFERENT PERSONNEL ABOUT ITV

A. PRINCIPAL

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	2.5	0.8	0.0	1.8
SOMETIMES	14.0	8.7	10.9	12.3
RARELY	22.9	22.8	19.6	22.6
NEVER	60.5	67.7	69.6	63.2
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	1.7	0.8	0.6	1.2
SOMETIMES	20.2	9.8	7.4	14.4
RARELY	25.6	19.5	13.0	20.8
NEVER	52.5	69.9	79.0	63.7

B. DEPT. CHAIR, SUBJECT SPECIALISTS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	3.4	3.9	4.0	3.6
SOMETIMES	11.7	18.8	24.0	14.9
RARELY	24.1	20.3	10.0	21.5
NEVER	60.8	57.0	62.0	59.9
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	1.2	4.8	2.6	2.7
SOMETIMES	16.7	21.8	19.9	19.2
RARELY	24.7	16.1	12.6	18.1
NEVER	57.4	57.3	64.9	60.0

C. OTHER SPECIALISTS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	3.4	2.4	2.1	3.0
SOMETIMES	14.6	12.1	19.1	14.4
RARELY	19.7	21.8	4.3	18.7
NEVER	62.4	63.7	74.5	63.9
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	2.7	5.6	1.3	3.0
SOMETIMES	20.3	8.8	9.4	14.1
RARELY	21.2	14.4	14.8	17.5
NEVER	55.9	71.2	74.5	65.3

D. OTHER TEACHERS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	6.1	2.4	0.0	4.6
SOMETIMES	37.4	24.2	26.1	32.9
RARELY	19.5	28.2	13.0	21.1
NEVER	37.1	45.2	60.9	41.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	6.9	2.3	2.5	4.6
SOMETIMES	40.8	26.3	24.5	32.9
RARELY	24.9	21.8	13.2	20.9
NEVER	27.4	49.6	59.7	41.7

E. ITV COORDINATOR

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	11.2	9.2	2.5	9.9
SOMETIMES	27.3	20.2	15.0	24.3
RARELY	15.4	16.0	10.0	15.1
NEVER	46.2	54.6	72.5	50.8
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	6.1	9.1	6.4	6.9
SOMETIMES	31.3	20.0	16.0	24.0
RARELY	25.3	10.9	10.4	17.3
NEVER	37.4	60.0	67.2	51.7

F. LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	14.0	8.7	10.9	12.3
SOMETIMES	30.8	28.3	19.6	29.1
RARELY	18.7	19.7	10.9	18.2
NEVER	36.4	42.5	58.7	40.1
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	10.1	9.0	5.7	8.7
SOMETIMES	28.3	27.1	20.3	25.8
RARELY	25.5	12.0	13.9	19.2
NEVER	36.0	51.9	60.1	46.3

G. PARENTS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
SOMETIMES	3.1	0.8	8.7	3.0
RARELY	14.3	11.4	4.3	12.6
NEVER	81.6	87.8	87.0	83.8
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.2
SOMETIMES	5.3	1.6	4.0	4.1
RARELY	19.6	8.7	7.9	14.0
NEVER	75.1	88.9	88.1	81.7

H. STUDENTS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	4.7	0.8	2.2	3.4
SOMETIMES	11.4	12.0	4.4	10.9
RARELY	18.5	12.8	11.1	16.3
NEVER	65.3	74.4	82.2	69.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	4.5	2.4	1.9	3.3
SOMETIMES	23.3	11.1	10.4	16.8
RARELY	21.1	15.9	13.6	17.8
NEVER	51.1	70.6	74.0	62.1

I. PROGRAM GUIDES

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	15.0	6.4	0.0	11.3
SOMETIMES	31.3	25.6	6.7	27.4
RARELY	14.0	16.8	28.9	16.2
NEVER	39.7	51.2	64.4	45.1
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	17.0	6.3	5.3	11.3
SOMETIMES	30.7	20.6	17.1	24.6
RARELY	17.8	19.0	9.9	15.9
NEVER	34.4	54.0	67.8	48.2

J. PREVIEWS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	2.8	4.1	0.0	2.9
SOMETIMES	20.6	15.4	4.7	17.6
RARELY	19.1	18.7	14.0	18.5
NEVER	57.4	61.8	81.4	60.9
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	7.4	3.4	2.2	5.1
SOMETIMES	23.8	18.1	11.1	19.0
RARELY	22.1	13.8	10.4	17.0
NEVER	46.7	64.7	76.3	59.0

K. OTHER

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
OFTEN	6.4	2.5	0.0	4.5
SOMETIMES	6.4	5.0	6.7	6.0
RARELY	6.4	15.0	0.0	8.3
NEVER	80.8	77.5	93.3	81.2
1980-81 STUDY:				
OFTEN	3.2	0.0	2.5	2.0
SOMETIMES	12.9	3.3	7.5	7.9
RARELY	12.9	3.3	7.5	7.9
NEVER	71.0	93.3	82.5	82.2

TEACHERS' PREPARATION FOR USE OF ITV

#48. TRAINING IN THE USE OF ITV

1983-84 STUDY:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	11.9	14.6	5.6	12.0

1980-81 STUDY:

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	11.5	13.0	15.0	12.9

#49. No data report.

#50. RECENT TRAINING

1983-84 STUDY:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
WITHIN THREE YEARS	15.0	17.2	0.0	14.1

1980-81 STUDY:

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
WITHIN THREE YEARS	16.5	16.2	17.8	16.8

#51. REQUIRED TRAINING

1983-84 STUDY:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
REQUIRED TRAINING	3.8	14.3	0.0	6.4

1980-81 STUDY:

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
REQUIRED TRAINING	8.0	4.7	5.1	6.1

CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE USE OF ITV

#52. PERCEPTIONS OF ITV

A. Teachers don't make enough use of ITV.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	46.0	57.8	60.0	50.4
NEITHER	38.9	35.6	32.0	37.4
DISAGREE	10.9	3.7	0.0	8.0
NA	4.1	3.0	8.0	4.2

1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	45.4	49.7	53.8	48.7
NEITHER	43.4	39.6	32.9	39.6
DISAGREE	9.6	4.0	5.2	7.1
NA	1.7	6.7	8.1	4.6

B. Pressure to achieve basic educational goals makes ITV a frill.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	49.0	31.3	23.5	42.0
NEITHER	23.3	35.1	35.3	27.5
DISAGREE	23.6	30.6	31.4	26.1
NA	4.1	3.0	9.8	4.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	44.4	37.3	32.6	39.4
NEITHER	28.5	31.7	30.3	29.7
DISAGREE	25.2	23.9	30.3	26.2
NA	2.0	7.0	6.9	4.5

C. If teachers in my school used ITV too much, there would be comments.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	60.1	46.6	54.9	56.2
NEITHER	20.4	32.8	23.5	23.8
DISAGREE	13.9	14.5	15.7	14.2
NA	5.6	6.1	5.9	5.8

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	57.2	44.5	44.3	50.7
NEITHER	27.9	35.0	30.5	30.3
DISAGREE	11.0	11.7	15.6	12.5
NA	3.8	8.8	9.6	6.6

D. There are short blocks of time in the day when ITV is really useful.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	64.8	48.1	46.0	58.7
NEITHER	19.5	30.1	28.0	23.0
DISAGREE	9.2	6.8	12.0	8.8
NA	6.5	15.0	14.0	9.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	68.2	45.3	37.3	54.3
NEITHER	17.2	30.9	32.0	24.5
DISAGREE	9.5	10.8	10.1	9.9
NA	5.1	12.9	20.7	11.3

E. Using ITV is much like using other supplementary teaching materials.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	86.0	77.8	82.7	83.6
NEITHER	7.7	14.1	5.8	9.1
DISAGREE	4.0	6.7	7.7	5.0
NA	2.3	1.5	3.8	2.2

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	80.3	66.9	69.8	74.2
NEITHER	13.1	18.7	14.2	14.7
DISAGREE	5.5	10.8	9.5	7.9
NA	1.0	3.6	6.5	3.2

F. There are a good many programs on ITV that meet my curriculum needs.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	53.4	25.8	37.3	44.8
NEITHER	28.2	42.4	29.4	31.9
DISAGREE	13.4	25.0	29.4	17.9
NA	5.0	6.8	3.9	5.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	58.4	28.1	24.4	42.1
NEITHER	28.5	34.8	25.6	29.1
DISAGREE	10.4	27.4	38.7	22.1
NA	2.7	9.6	11.3	6.7

G. ITV is a useful teaching tool.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	78.5	74.6	76.5	77.3
NEITHER	17.2	20.9	17.6	18.1
DISAGREE	1.7	1.5	2.0	1.7
NA	2.3	3.0	3.9	2.6
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	82.7	68.1	70.7	76.0
NEITHER	14.1	25.7	21.3	18.8
DISAGREE	2.3	0.7	1.1	1.6
NA	1.0	5.6	6.9	3.7

H. Some parents express concerns about the amount of ITV watched in classrooms.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	13.0	10.8	10.0	12.1
NEITHER	26.8	44.6	42.0	32.8
DISAGREE	39.2	29.2	22.0	35.0
NA	21.1	15.4	26.0	20.1
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	10.1	7.7	5.8	8.4
NEITHER	36.4	45.8	37.4	38.9
DISAGREE	33.7	19.0	29.2	29.0
NA	19.9	26.8	27.5	23.6

COMMENTS ON ITV

Teachers made the following comments:

1. As far as social studies is concerned, we need more programming geared to upper level students (Junior/Seniors) on specialized and/or specific topics. Then, ITV would be useful and helpful and used. We also need periodic announcements, via mail, regarding such programming. Relying on one's use of the Yearly Program Schedule Book is a bit much - especially since every teacher doesn't receive such.

2. I have stopped searching for a relevant program or series to apply to Senior High School English - literature, word study, even grammar - because everything listed in the catalog is geared to elementary or sometimes middle school level. The one series I have used is on Career Education-Jobs, but it is really offensive to most of my students because it appears to be written on a low intellectual level - lower even than average students and useless with college bound. Can you not survey the general curricular areas in the state (most everyone does Hemingway, we do American lit. & British lit, we do units on poetry, the short story, drama, we do regular Vocab. work & ton of grammar; we even do sentence diagramming in depth and create programming that is relevant, realistic and scholarly. I can think of a great Vocab. series* - students could copy words, lots of classroom activities could be included in the supplementary materials, a cumulative list of words could be kept and final tests could even be supplied. You do have excellent print materials with your handbooks, etc., but the shows are not the quality I'd like.

   * I can think of grammar series too - you have all the facilities to make grammar clear - use of color, animation, special effects, etc. - far beyond our limitations. Why are you not doing more high school level shows? Are there too few high-level students? Are there too few high-level writers and creators? Hire me - I'll do it!

3. I would like the shows to be longer 30-45 minutes. It's a lot of work to set up equipment for 15 mins. or so. Also our recording equipment is old and is of poor quality. Since I teach the same subject to 5 classes, I need to copy the programs for use with all classes. This is often difficult so I don't always bother. The programs are excellent - I just wish they were easily accessible. An inservice program advertising programs & support from our administrator to use them would be helpful.

4. Our school system has some of the ITV series built right into our curriculum. Each year I use it more and more. I enjoy watching it, and the students enjoy watching it too.

5. We do not receive a strong enough signal to use ITV.

6. The 1/4 hour averaged weekly is high; only one week's worth of use actually. In PE videotaping is extremely important in teaching certain skills.

7. ITV is a very useful tool and provides many excellent programs that meet my classroom needs. However, being departmentalized and having a rotating schedule make it very difficult to use these programs.

8. I enjoy using ITV with my library classes as applicable, and/or supplementing classroom subjects as requested by teachers. However, I found that in the 83/84 season, many useful programs were scheduled during our lunch/recess time (elementary level). Hopefully, I can use the Grimm Bros. program next year. I enjoyed the preview in Spring 83.

9. This form is much much too long.

10. Availability of a television.

11. Only 1 TV in school is the BIG problem. Just purchased a VCR.

12. I hope Readalong is offered more often. Especially during Kindergarten Session time - 8:30 - 11:15 and 12:30 - 3:15.

13. I would use ITV if the programs were good. They do not fit in with what I teach!

14. Our TV sets are usually in need of repair. There are scheduling conflicts. There are too few sets for too many teachers. Thus, the ITV program in this school is not utilized anywhere near its capacity. This is a difficult form to answer - time consuming and I'm not very familiar with the programs, attitudes within the school, etc.

15. The programming on ITV for the most part is excellent. It has been difficult for me to answer this questionnaire accurately and effectively because the terminology used in the questions did not always apply directly to elementary curriculum. I would be very appreciative of some inservice instruction in teachers workshop or faculty meetings in the effective use of ITV in conjunction with Baltimore County Curriculum Guides. ITV is a valuable teaching tool and could be used even more effectively if provision were made for teacher instruction.

16. Assignment the World is a tremendous way to bring news into children's lives. The clues and questions make them active listeners. Thank you for such an excellent program.

17. Assignment: The World makes children aware of current events and world happenings which they would otherwise ignore. I use this program to introduce the weekly newspaper. Often stories in Weekly Reader and Assignment are the same or of similar interest.

18. Kindergarten meets in A.M. and P.M. sessions. It is difficult to arrange my schedule when you offer a show I watch on differing days. Ex. A.M. time Tues., P.M. time Thurs. I would like to see an A.M. and P.M. time offered on the same day.

19. Since I began watching the Song Bag & Book, Look, Listen (5-6 yrs. ago) the shows have never changed. I'm tired of the same shows. When will new ones be taped?

20. I would like the programs to be more accessible through videotapes, but having more lenient recording rights. Many of the programs would be very helpful, if I could show them to fit my teaching schedule. I'm an avid supporter of ITV - the children are attentive and enthusiastic and the experiences provided are limitless. Some of the shows that were listed I have used in the past, but could not fit in this year because of scheduling. A question indicating any use in the past might be helpful to you.

21. I have not used ITV with my students this year. I had planned to do so, but time did not permit me to learn to use the VCR equipment. (We need more people on our faculty who can operate the equipment and can show others how to do so.) I did view several lessons from the "Counterplot" series, and I feel that they would be most beneficial to my classes. In the future, I am planning to make videotapes of these shows for use with my classes at the appropriate times. It is unfortunate that such opportunities as the use of ITV often are neglected due to an overload of work experienced by most teachers!

22. Our school is a special situation in that it is especially created for behavioral problems. Our staff numbers 5; our student population 50. Our building is old and we have no media center, etc. ITV could be beneficial however circumstances do not make its use available to us.

23. Unfortunately our school does not have any of this equipment and we are unfamiliar with its uses.

24. We cannot use ITV as there is no suitable antenna to make reception possible. Efforts to obtain the antenna by teachers has been thwarted by administrators.

25. Good work!

26. We are just beginning to get set up for use of ITV in our school. Volunteers have been selected for recording and recording equipment has been purchased. We should have considerable use of ITV in the coming school year 1984-85.

27. It would be helpful if it ran parallel to our teaching units in the grades (Social Studies - grade 3) etc.
Communities

28. I think one of the best things kids can do is to interact with the TV. A program like Assignment: The World does just that with its pop quizzes and its requests for student letters on various topics. Because of those reasons, I feel it is the #1 best program on any TV for kids.

29. I have always used ITV, except for this year. I have found no time in my schedule due to increased pressure for reading and math results.

30. I would like to see more language development programs for pre-school and kindergarten.

31. The scheduling of many of the useful ITV programs does not coordinate with the classroom schedule. Recording equipment is not available to allow us to "time shift" the programs. I believe some of the programs would enrich our basic curriculum.

32. In 1977-78 I was teaching a full day kindergarten program. During that year I was able to use ITV with my class. We especially enjoyed Book, Look & Listen, The Song Bag and Afloat & Aboat. Since that time I have morning and afternoon classes and although we have a TV in our room the time schedule does not allow us to use ITV. The above programs might be scheduled for one class but not available to the other. We have only 1 video tape player in the school so taping for later use is not possible either.

33. In previous years I have used ITV regularly. This year I have not used ITV, but plan to incorporate it in my curriculum next year. I feel ITV programming has improved over the years and is a very good educational/supplemental teaching tool.

34. There are so many demands to do things during a school day that I just can't fit everything. There are a lot of wonderful things that the children enjoy and watch at home. Especially the homes that don't have cable. It would be helpful to have more shows on videotape that can be pulled out when appropriate.

35. I never use ITV, because I teach large groups; around 60, programs never seem to suit my needs in instrumental music, and the programming does not coincide with practical use in my classes. I also have my pressing curriculum requirements to fulfill and limited scheduling, as is, ITV would only be a burden unless it had some pertinent material. The programs seem to be vocally oriented rather than instrumental.

36. This entire form, in my case, is insignificant as it asks questions to which I cannot supply answers that are meaningful as they are inappropriate.

37. Assignment the World is really unique! I think a "talk" show with Lucille Clifton (poet laureate) and others would be good or extension of "Truly American" to a "Truly Marylander."

38. Because children today are exposed daily to TV, it is often an effective method to teaching the social sciences. Very young children are eager to learn, but not being able to read hampers learning. For me an ideal teaching situation for primary children is one which is interesting and informative. ITV can supply many of the informative pictorial lessons not always accessible to me.

39. We are an 8 A.M. to 2 P.M. school. The programming does not fall within our subject areas.

40. Our Outdoor Ed. program (4th grade) has one trip based on Water Safety. I was moved to kindergarten this year and we are not to use the ITV at this level.

41. Biggest problem of ITV; so little time to teach the basic necessary things. I feel pressured not to use it so we can move onward.

42. As mentioned on question 37, I found Inside Out a useful teaching tool for my emotionally handicapped student. I used the program for several years and then it disappeared. New episodes should be recorded. This program guide was also excellent for this series. More effective educational shows please.

43. Our school is entirely special-moderately intellectually limited. Many of your programs are on the level of our students, but not appropriate due to primary content and presentation. Other programs I find the content above our students level. Perhaps a program or two for special ed - low achievement student would be helpful.

44. I'm looking for ITV programs that fit into my 6th grade Balto. Co. science program. Because of my required units, I am unable to use ITV at certain times since we have covered a particular unit back in Sept. or Oct.

45. When we have adequate numbers of TV sets, and when teachers no longer permit student abuse of equipment, ITV may be an asset.

46. If at all possible, I think all would benefit if more guides were available so we can use what, I'm sure, is well worth our kids' time.

47. I would use ITV as a supplement to my teaching if programs were on the level of the materials being taught. As a matter of fact, I sent for some free literature on composers, humanities; and Our Town which helped me tremendously in planning one year. I do not know if this service is still available, but I would like to know if it is. I am pleased to be reminded that this is still offered because I had forgotten about it. It would be better for me if more music programs were offered on the senior high level. A number of teachers will be teaching American music and would welcome a supplement to this unit in the city.

48. Last year I was involved in a program in which I was not based at the school. I am embarrassed that I don't know more about ITV. I have only used 2 series Jobs & Give and Take. Both were excellent but I never saw a program guide. I'm also unaware of the other programs available.

49. Years ago, when I had a TV set in my classroom, I tried to make use of the ITV programs, but found the scheduling very difficult. (e.g., appropriate programs were available during the lunch hour or during P.E. or music, etc.) The reception was never very good, either. We do not now have a VCR at our school which could be used to tape programs for later use.

50. There is nothing relevant to foreign language learning and culture. Why not? I would make use of it!

51. We (both 5 grades) used "Read All About It". Children looked forward to the program and watched it at home if for some reason they were not at school. Assignment: The World is a good newsworthy program. The short quizzes and lead questions and puzzles for the next week are exciting to the children. Love Ginny Batchelor (sp?) We plan to use both of these again next year.

52. Would appreciate some 1 hour or 1/2 hour programs of high interest to be used in June (Story type).

53. Most significant problem with ITV is scheduling. Times for math and science programming do not coordinate with our classroom schedule. It is difficult arranging for programs to be taped and use of video cassette equipment is limited.

54. In Ohio a person came to the school to help us match the curriculum to the available programs. He/she showed us how to use the programs with pre and post watching techniques. Guides were numerous & available as were schedules. We shared ideas as far as appropriate grade levels for each show etc. with fellow teachers. Demonstration teaching was available.

55. Rigid guidelines concerning educational timelines and unit planning and scheduling do not adapt readily to ITV in my classroom situation.

56. Suggestions: Instructional workshops and visitations for public showing in the classroom. Guides sent to the school for preview instructions before class.

57. If ITV has advantages for secondary math teachers, I certainly am not aware of them. As far as I know, there are no teachers making use of ITV at my school.

58. Baltimore City scheduling (on a daily basis) makes ITV viewing most difficult to insert in the schedule. Times conflict with programming.

59. Three years ago, this school system had an administration and a media specialist which encourage the use of ITV. After a renewal of both, the TVs were removed and we received no more ITV manuals, schedules, etc. When I used ITV, I found it to be an effective complement to my lessons.

60. I would like to see more vocationally oriented materials provided that is to say, shop type programs. If not on shop practices then at least on shop safety, attitudes, student organization, management, etc. These items can be of central theme and applied to all various types of shop programs.

61. As an art teacher, I feel it is more important for students to have direct experiences working with various materials to explore various art concepts. Since every class and every student is different, I prefer to design my own lessons to meet their needs. Films, slide programs and presumably ITV might not spend enough time on certain points or go on in too much depth on others causing students to lose interest.

62. I think it unfortunate that this questionnaire was given to a teacher who knew nothing about ITV.

63. Jan. 20th will be here before you know it!

64. Make new teachers aware of ITV and what programs are available (although I doubt if it meets my needs at this time.)

65. This current school year 83-84 our high school is undergoing renovations so the use of the ITV has been impossible in the outside trailers. In the new rooms a TV and cable TV are supposed to be supplied.

66. ITV is a viable entity. I support the legitimate use of it. The problem is not enough equipment for the demand.

67. I have never used ITV.

68. Information should be made available for proper use of ITV (i.e.) length of time per class period. Teachers who use ITV for a complete period - are in fact overusing the system. It is difficult for students to absorb so much information. Most ITV lessons should be divided into 10 min. seg.

69. There are many good programs available for family living. Use of the programs would vary according to the teacher's class schedule. I see ITV as a valuable teaching tool - a supplement to existing curriculum.

70. As far as I am aware, there are only 3 or 4 television sets in the building and 3 VCR units ... and we have 1400 students! No teacher can plan on regular use of the equipment, therefore we ignore regularly scheduled shows and occasionally use videotape "specials".

71. As a reading specialist in an elementary school, I used ITV often. My classes enjoyed the various programs. For the past 5 years, however, I have been working a senior high school.

When I go through your catalog, I can't find any programs that would fit with my Rapid Reading, SAT Prep, and Vocabulary classes. A program that would help my poor readers is on at the wrong time. I have no blank videotapes on which to tape, nor time available for this. Unfortunately, ITV is eliminated from my planning.

72. I found ITV especially useful in in-service instruction of teachers in "The Writing Process". Our coordinator, Allan Starkey, appeared in the program and used it in his instructional workshop. I found it clear, helpful and concise.

73. Washington County ITV system provides an excellent math series for grade 4-8, entitled Math Lab. I have used this series for 3 years.

74. We don't have a catalog of what's been taped so it is difficult to match up programs with curriculum. Frankly, it's often more time consuming than it's worth to plan for ITV.

75. The use of ITV depends on the scheduling of the programs. Our media person is very poor at taping programs. It is very difficult to preview programs before use. Many of the guides need to be updated. I think many teachers in our school feel ITV is a waste of time, but I use it anyway and the students really like it!

76. I find that your programming falls into two categories: 1) High school 2) pre-elementary - elementary. There are not quality shows geared to the middle school student. The middle school student can concentrate more than 15 minutes - and they don't need cutesy fluff people to entertain them. Before you can develop programming for them you really need to understand them from people who work with them 180 school days a year.

77. I find the ITV especially helpful to reinforce note taking skills.

78. Keep up the good work!

79. I am very interested in finding out more about ITV.

80. I found this questionnaire difficult to fill out after only teaching for two months. Although I had experience with ITV while student teaching in a kindergarten the pressures of learning new curriculum and planning this school year have been so great that it will be quite some time before I have time to sit down and check out our ITV system and guides to see if I feel they will be useful for my children.

81. I am new at this school and in the school system. For this reason, I was unable to answer a lot of the questions.

82. Starting Fall of '84 the new media specialist is interested in TV.

83. The few times I was able to use the ITV I felt the series was good. However, being in Montgomery County with all the objec-

tives we are held accountable for, I find it impossible to take the time for those things which make teaching interesting and worthwhile for the children. We are "locked in".

84. Many teachers use instructional TV for their own background. They share this information in various ways with their classes when "in school time" is insufficient for class viewing.

85. It would certainly be beneficial to have an inservice ITV workshop. I am unaware of its availability and programming. It is my feeling that most children would benefit from this educational programming.

86. When I taught 4th grade, I found the videotapes on Maryland very useful and well done.

87. I would like more information on ITV.

88. Our teachers would like the same program shown at various times during the week.

89. This questionnaire was too long. The questions were poorly constructed. Some questions left no alternatives. Some questions were difficult to interpret. The questionnaire came out when teachers were preparing final exams and final reports.

90. We have recorded the Today's Families Series. I have used it regularly (each week) for several years. I have not used it this year solely because I have changed rooms and it is too difficult to carry the equipment up and down stairs. However, we have recently acquired (the Home Economics Dept.) a VTR, Monitor, ourselves and I look forward to using taped video materials again! Very useful in teaching child development concepts.

91. Many times the material presented proceeds at too slow a pace - (the students get "turned off" fast). Many times I have felt as I watched my classes watching the programs that there was too much "teaching down" to them. It would have been better to have more "meat" in a selected, single program.

COMPLETION TIME

Teachers took an average of 21.3 minutes to complete the survey questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

Teachers' use of ITV has increased slightly since 1981. Availability of equipment such as color monitors has also increased. Facilities for recording ITV programs for playback at a later time have also improved, but teachers do not take advantage of this capability as often as they might.

Elementary teachers continue to be the strongest users and supporters of ITV, but teachers at all levels report positive attitudes toward the contributions of ITV in the instructional process. Teachers also continue to feel that students, principals, school library media specialists and system-specialists favor the use of ITV. Teachers' ratings of the 1983-1984 programs were generally positive, but some programs were rated by only a few teachers. Very few teachers feel that ITV is used too much by other teachers and most feel that from 1/2 hour to 2 hours per week would be used, given optimum conditions. Teachers report a variety of positive student outcomes from the use of ITV; the most frequently reported were expanded knowledge, expanded vocabulary and students' follow-up of ideas expressed on ITV. Teachers feel that ITV is most useful to all students as opposed to use for specialized groups (such as high or low ability).

There is a generally close correspondence between the teachers' responses to the present study and the 1980-81 study. Most of the changes noted were positive ones which indicate continued support and use of ITV by teachers.

LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS

INTRODUCTION

One hundred and forty-nine library media specialists (71.3%) responded to the Maryland ITV Questionnaires. The same procedure for reporting results is used in this section as in the teachers' section.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In the survey, 59.3% of elementary schools, 40.0% of middle schools and 34.5% of secondary schools reported having volunteer services. 51.4% of all schools reported using volunteers:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USE VOLUNTEERS	59.3	40.0	34.5	51.4
HOURS PER WEEK	7.8	3.6	23.4	5.0

This reveals an increase since the 1981 study. The average school with volunteers reported using them for 5.0 hours per week.

Regarding school descriptions, 77.2% of the library media specialists reported their schools are organized around self-contained classrooms. 14.7% reported non-traditional or open-space patterns.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SELF-CONTAINED	71.9	77.8	93.1	77.2
NON-TRADITIONAL	18.0	11.1	3.4	14.7
OTHER	10.1	11.1	3.4	8.9

"Other" descriptions included:

	DESCRIPTION	NO. RESPONDING
1.	Both 1 & 2	5
2.	Combined self-contained/departmentalized	3
3.	Departmental	2
4.	Team teaching & self contained levels	1
5.	Modified open space	1
6.	Some team teaching	1
7.	Home rooms with grouping for language arts and math	1
8.	We are a high school for pre-professional arts training as well as academics	1
9.	Middle School Teams	1
10.	Homeroom, children change rooms for S.S. & Science & L.A.	1

When asked about their years of experience as library media specialists and as educators, specialists responded as follows:

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
LMS at Present School				
1 YEAR	13.6	15.0	10.3	13.2
2-3 YEARS	15.9	15.0	17.2	19.1
4-6 YEARS	20.5	30.0	17.2	21.3
7-9 YEARS	20.5	5.0	17.2	17.5
10+ YEARS	29.5	35.0	37.9	32.2

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
Educator				
1 YEAR	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.0
2-3 YEARS	0.0	0.0	3.8	1.0
4-6 YEARS	6.2	13.3	0.0	5.7
7-9 YEARS	12.3	20.0	7.8	12.3
10+ YEARS	80.2	66.7	84.6	79.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
LMS at Present School				
1 YEAR	17.1	10.6	9.3	13.3
2-3 YEARS	22.4	27.7	16.3	22.3
4-6 YEARS	23.7	21.3	30.2	24.7
7-9 YEARS	18.4	17.0	11.6	16.3
10+ YEARS	18.4	23.4	32.6	23.5
Educator				
1 YEAR	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.7
2-3 YEARS	7.9	5.0	0.0	5.0
4-6 YEARS	9.5	7.5	8.1	8.6
7-9 YEARS	12.7	17.5	10.8	13.6
10+ YEARS	68.3	70.0	81.1	72.1

There has been an overall increase in the years of experience of library media specialists. This may reflect some overall stability in the profession in terms of how many are staying in individual schools.

Concerning current Maryland certification status, 82.8% of the specialists reported having certification appropriate for library media specialists. The rather high percentage (21.0) of middle school library media specialists who reported they are not certified is a cause for some concern. Those reporting "other" certification has declined from 37.5% in 1981 to only 5.8% today.

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ASSOCIATE	5.5	5.3	6.9	5.8
GENERALIST	28.6	21.1	29.0	28.1
SPECIALIST	49.5	42.1	51.7	48.9
ADMINISTRATOR	1.1	10.5	3.4	2.8
OTHER CERTIFICATION	6.6	0.0	6.9	5.8
NOT CERTIFIED	8.8	21.0	0.0	8.6

"Other" certifications included:

	CERTIFICATION	NO. RESPONDING
1.	English	7
2.	Elementary Education	3
3.	Library Science 7-12	1
4.	Advanced Professional	2
5.	History	2
6.	Advanced Prof. K-12	1
7.	Teacher K-8	1
8.	Social Studies	1
9.	French	1
10.	Librarian	2
11.	Reading	1
12.	Media Specialist	1
13.	Teacher/Librarian	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ASSOCIATE	13.5	2.4	4.5	8.1
GENERALIST	27.0	42.9	45.5	36.2
SPECIALIST	45.9	52.4	43.2	46.9
ADMINISTRATOR	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.4
OTHER CERTIFICATION	33.8	40.5	40.9	37.5
NOT CERTIFIED	5.4	0.0	0.0	2.5

AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

#6. AVAILABILITY OF ITV PROGRAMMING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	98.8	100.0	96.6	98.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	98.7	95.7	95.5	97.0

ITV continues to be available in almost every Maryland public school.

#7. AVAILABILITY OF TELEVISION SETS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
BLACK AND WHITE	3.8	3.8	3.2	3.7
COLOR	5.4	7.1	6.7	5.9
TOTAL	9.2	10.8	8.9	9.3
NONE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

There has been a slight decrease in the number of black and white sets, from four or five in 1981 to 3.7 today. There is an overall increase in the average number of sets, and no schools reported being without sets.

#8. ESTIMATE OF TEACHERS REGULARLY USING ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	4.5	0.0	6.2	4.2
2	10.6	0.0	12.5	9.5
3	18.1	23.1	0.0	15.7
4	7.6	0.0	6.2	5.3
5	9.0	15.4	12.5	10.5
6	15.1	15.4	0.0	12.6
7	3.0	15.4	0.0	4.2
8	3.0	7.7	6.2	4.2
9	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.2
10	6.0	7.7	12.5	7.4
10+	18.1	15.4	56.2	24.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
0	12.0	20.0	26.8	17.9
1	5.3	5.0	7.3	5.8
2	6.7	15.0	2.4	7.7
3	13.3	20.0	7.3	13.5
4	9.3	10.0	9.8	9.6
5	9.3	10.0	2.4	7.7
6	6.7	0.0	2.4	3.8
7	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
8	6.7	5.0	2.4	5.1
9	1.3	0.0	2.4	1.3
10	9.3	7.5	9.8	9.0
10+	15.9	7.5	27.0	16.7

Estimates of teachers using ITV have increased since 1981. For example, those estimating that five or less use ITV has decreased from 62.2% in 1981 to 45.2%. The percentage estimating that ten-plus teachers use ITV has increased from 16.7% in 1981 to 24.2% today. Those estimating that six or more teachers use ITV increased from 37.8% in 1981 to 55.8% in 1984.

#9. TELEVISION MEDIA AVAILABLE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DIRECT ON-AIR	83.5	90.0	93.1	86.4
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	78.0	90.0	93.1	82.9
VIDEODISC	1.0	5.0	0.0	1.4
CABLE TV	23.1	30.0	24.1	24.3
CLOSED CIRCUIT	28.6	15.0	31.0	27.1
DON'T KNOW	2.2	0.0	3.4	2.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
DIRECT ON-AIR	88.5	89.1	88.6	88.7
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	46.2	76.1	88.6	65.5
VIDEODISC	0.0	0.0	4.5	1.2
CABLE TV	7.7	10.9	9.1	8.9
CLOSED CIRCUIT	28.2	39.1	45.5	35.7
DON'T KNOW	3.8	0.0	0.0	1.8

There is an increase in the number of library media specialists reporting that cassette/videotape is available, from 65.5% in 1981 to 82.9% today. Library media specialists reported cable TV availability in 24.3% of schools, up from 8.9% in 1981. Other categories remain essentially unchanged.

#10. QUALITY OF TELEVISION RECEPTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	58.2	55.0	50.0	56.1
FAIR	34.1	40.0	21.4	32.3
POOR	7.6	5.0	28.6	12.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	67.5	60.9	52.3	61.7
FAIR	26.0	23.9	31.8	26.9
POOR	6.5	15.2	15.9	11.4

Reception appears to be unchanged or slightly worse since 1981. Overall, 44.3% reported only fair to poor reception.

#11. LOCATION OF TELEVISION SETS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
CLASSROOMS	58.2	45.0	28.6	50.3
CENTRAL STORAGE	28.6	10.0	25.0	25.2
AUDITORIUM	3.3	0.0	3.6	2.9
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	8.8	40.0	35.7	18.7
OTHER	1.0	5.0	7.1	3.6

"Other" locations included:

LOCATION	NO. RESPONDING
1. Some in classrooms, some in M.C., some in storage.	2
2. Circulate to classrooms	2
3. One per grade level - different areas	1
4. Central locations on 3 floors	1
5. Instructional studio where teacher has classes on drama & TV production	1
6. Classrooms & storage area	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
CLASSROOMS	46.8	30.4	11.4	32.9
CENTRAL LOCATION	20.8	30.4	18.2	22.8
AUDITORIUM	2.6	0.0	2.3	1.8
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	7.8	17.4	43.2	19.8
MORE THAN ONE	20.8	15.2	20.5	19.2
OTHER	1.3	6.5	4.5	3.6

TV sets are more likely to be located in individual classrooms in elementary schools, while in high schools, they are more likely to be in classrooms, the library media center or in central storage locations.

#12. ARRANGEMENTS FOR TELEVISION USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STUDENTS TO TV	5.5	10.0	3.6	5.8
SETS TO STUDENTS	41.8	40.0	42.9	41.7
ONE OR OTHER	22.0	25.0	42.9	26.6
SETS IN CLASSROOM	30.8	25.0	10.7	25.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STUDENTS TO TV	9.2	8.7	7.0	8.5
SETS TO STUDENTS	36.8	23.9	41.9	34.5
ONE OR OTHER	19.7	47.8	39.5	32.7
SETS IN CLASSROOM	31.6	19.6	11.6	23.0

#13. TV MONITOR CONFLICTS BETWEEN ITV USAGE AND MICROCOMPUTER USAGE

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DAILY	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.5
1 PER WEEK	1.1	5.0	3.6	2.3
1 PER MONTH	2.4	0.0	3.6	2.3
1 PER SEMESTER	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
RARELY	11.8	15.0	28.6	15.9
NEVER	80.0	80.0	64.3	77.2

A large percentage of library media specialists (93.1%) reported that there is rarely or never a conflict between use of television sets for ITV and for computers. While 6.9% reported that there are occasional conflicts, this does not appear to be a very serious problem.

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#14. LOCATION OF MICROCOMPUTERS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MATH/SCIENCE	11.0	35.0	82.6	29.5
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	46.2	35.0	34.5	42.4
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES	6.6	15.0	31.0	12.9
OTHER	46.2	40.0	27.6	41.7

"Other" locations included:

	LOCATION	NO. RESPONDING
1.	We have none	14
2.	Classroom	14
3.	Computer room	5
4.	Business class	4
5.	Separate room	2
6.	Empty classroom	2
7.	Circulate to classrooms	2
8.	Special education	2
9.	One in each pod	1
10.	Special room	1
11.	Pods	1
12.	5th grade classroom - gifted & talented	1
13.	Lab	1
14.	Science classroom & one on mobile cart	1
15.	Data processing classrooms	1
16.	Conference room	1
17.	Title I classroom	1
18.	English	1

Microcomputer locations seem to depend upon the level. In high school, 82.6% of library media specialists reported that some are located in the math/science classrooms, while only 11% of elementary library media specialists reported that location. Elementary school library media centers also appear to be a more likely location than at the middle or high school levels.

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#15. HOW OFTEN ARE SETS IN GOOD REPAIR?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	28.6	25.0	14.3	25.2
MOST OF THE TIME	65.9	70.0	71.4	67.6
SOME OF THE TIME	2.2	5.0	10.7	4.3
SELDOM	2.2	0.0	3.6	2.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	29.9	24.4	20.5	25.9
MOST OF THE TIME	63.6	60.0	68.2	63.9
SOME OF THE TIME	3.9	11.1	6.8	6.6
SELDOM	2.6	4.4	4.5	3.6

Library media specialists reported that sets are in good repair always or most of the time. This is consistent with findings reported in the 1980-81 study.

#16. USE OF LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATE VIDEOTAPE LIBRARY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PRE-RECORDED PROGRAMS	76.9	80.0	70.4	76.1

Use of the pre-recorded programs from local system, regional, or state videotape libraries has increased since 1981. Today 76.1% of all schools reported that they acquire pre-recorded programs; this is up from approximately 40% reported in the earlier study.

#17. VIEWING ARRANGEMENTS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
WITH ANOTHER CLASS	43.9	55.0	31.0	43.2
WHOLE CLASS ALONE	86.8	95.0	72.4	85.6
SMALL GROUPS	18.7	15.0	37.9	22.3
INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	5.5	10.0	34.5	12.2
NEVER USE	7.8	0.0	20.6	9.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
WITH ANOTHER CLASS	64.0	47.8	53.5	56.7
WHOLE CLASS ALONE	86.7	95.7	86.0	89.0
SMALL GROUPS	24.0	45.7	37.2	33.5
INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	4.0	17.0	37.2	16.5
NEVER USE	2.7	6.5	11.6	6.1

#18. REPAIR PROCEDURES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
REPAIRED IN BLDG.	3.3	10.0	7.4	5.0
CENTRAL REPAIR SHOP	37.8	40.0	25.9	35.5
HIRE REPAIRMAN	31.1	25.0	40.7	31.7
NO POLICY	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.4
OTHER	25.6	25.0	29.6	26.1

"Other" procedures included:

PROCEDURE	NO. RESPONDING
1. Co. system sends repairman	30
2. Repaired by LAMS personnel	2
3. Don't know	1
4. Combination of 1 & 3, depending on condition of set	1
5. Haven't needed repair yet	1
6. We have TV rep. who checked with us constantly	1
7. Repair personnel visit school bi-weekly	1
8. Central repairman comes to the building (if he feels like it)	1
9. I handle simple problems	1
10. TV man comes to school	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
REPAIRED IN BLDG.	1.4	2.3	0.0	1.3
CENTRAL REPAIR SHOP	60.0	77.3	81.8	70.9
HIRE REPAIRMAN	25.7	18.2	13.6	20.3
NO POLICY	5.7	0.0	2.3	3.2
OTHER	7.1	2.3	2.3	4.4

The number of schools using the central repair shop has decreased since 1981 while those making other arrangements have increased from 4.4% in 1981 to 26.1% today, but it should be noted that 30 individuals said that a repairperson is sent by the school system.

#19. TELEVISION-RELATED SERVICES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
EARPHONE	21.9	25.0	20.7	22.3
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	24.2	25.0	13.8	20.9
TV STUDIO	8.8	15.0	24.1	12.9
TAPE LIBRARY/SCHOOL	27.5	45.0	37.9	32.3
TAPE LIBRARY/SYSTEM	64.8	65.0	68.9	66.2
OTHER	13.0	10.0	0.0	5.0

"Other" related services included:

1. Record own programs on VTR
2. Don't know
3. Limited videotape library in school
4. The library is used each Friday for a TV studio.

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
EARPHONES	34.0	32.5	41.2	35.5
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	31.9	25.0	17.6	25.6
TV STUDIO	14.9	20.0	32.4	21.5
TAPE LIBRARY SCHOOL	19.1	47.5	61.8	40.5
TAPE LIBRARY DISTRICT	55.3	47.5	58.8	53.7
OTHER	4.3	0.0	2.9	2.5

The most frequently available service category reported was the system videotape library (66.2%), representing an increase from 1981, followed by the videotape library in the school (32.3%).

#20. USE OF VIDEOTAPE RECORDERS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USE	57.1	90.0	77.8	65.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
USE	38.2	80.0	75.0	59.4

There has been an increase in the reported use of VTR's, especially in elementary and middle schools. Overall, there was a reported increase in use, from 59.4% in 1981 to 65.9% today.

#21. VIDEOTAPING PROGRAMS OFF THE AIR

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PERSON AVAILABLE	54.9	70.0	88.5	63.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PERSON AVAILABLE	37.7	80.5	86.5	64.9

Overall, library media specialists reported little change in the taping of programs off the air. At the elementary level there was a reported increase, from 37.7% to 54.9%, while a decline from 80.5% to 70.0% was reported at the middle school level.

#22. PRODUCTION OF PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOL

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PROGRAMS PRODUCED	48.5	70.5	83.3	59.6
TO WHAT END:				
INSTRUCTIONAL USE	26.4	40.0	58.6	35.3
ADMINISTRATIVE USE	3.2	15.0	10.3	6.5
INSERVICE	9.9	15.0	13.8	11.5
STUDENT EXPERIENCE	38.5	35.0	58.6	42.4
TEACHER FEEDBACK	15.4	15.0	34.5	19.4
STUDENT FEEDBACK	36.3	40.0	68.9	43.9
OTHER	4.4	5.0	6.9	5.0

"Other" purposes included:

1. Show parents
2. Plays - assemblies
3. Sports
4. As needed basis
5. G & T students produced a program for parents

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
PROGRAMS PRODUCED	44.3	70.5	80.0	61.0
TO WHAT END:				
INSTRUCTIONAL USE	57.6	71.0	78.1	68.8
ADMINISTRATIVE USE	15.2	9.7	18.8	14.6
INSERVICE	12.1	16.1	34.4	20.8
STUDENT EXPERIENCE	72.7	77.4	81.3	77.1
TEACHER FEEDBACK	27.3	25.8	50.0	34.4
STUDENT FEEDBACK	66.7	80.6	87.5	78.1
OTHER	18.2	9.7	15.6	14.6

#23. PRODUCTION RESPONSIBILITY

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	100.0	78.5	79.2	86.6
CLASSROOM TEACHER	43.9	42.8	33.3	39.0
STUDENTS	12.2	14.3	8.3	10.9
ITV COORDINATOR	14.6	7.1	8.3	10.9
OTHER	4.9	14.3	20.8	10.9

"Other" persons responsible included:

PERSON	NO. RESPONDING
1. Area technical services aide	3
2. Limited use in building	1
3. Media aide	1
4. Drama teacher	1
5. English teacher	1
6. Theater technical people	1
7. Persons in charge of news show	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	87.5	69.7	73.5	77.6
CLASSROOM TEACHER	37.5	24.2	41.2	34.6
STUDENTS	7.5	6.1	20.6	11.2
ITV COORDINATOR	20.0	12.1	11.8	15.0
OTHER	10.0	12.1	20.6	14.0

School library media specialists reported that they have primary responsibility for in-school video production. There was an increase in this area from the 1981 study, from 77.6% in 1981 to 86.8% today.

SUPPORT OF ITV

#24. MEDIA SPECIALISTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS ITV USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	14.6	10.0	22.2	15.8
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	70.8	80.0	59.3	71.4
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	13.5	10.0	18.5	14.3
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	22.7	17.4	16.3	19.5
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	64.0	73.9	65.1	67.1
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	13.3	8.7	16.3	12.8
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.6
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

87.2% of library media specialists reported that they strongly encourage or encourage (but leave to teacher discretion) the use of ITV. This corresponds to the results reported in 1981.

#25. SYSTEMS' ATTITUDES TOWARD ITV USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	16.7	15.0	25.9	18.2
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	68.9	75.0	55.6	67.2
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	12.2	10.0	18.5	13.1
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.5
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	18.9	13.0	7.0	14.1
ENCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	71.6	69.6	83.7	74.2
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	6.8	15.2	7.0	9.2
DISCOURAGE BUT LEAVE TO TEACHER DISCRETION	1.4	2.2	0.0	1.2
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Library media specialists view systems' attitudes toward the use of ITV as being very positive. 85.4% felt the system either strongly encourages use or encourages use leaving discretion to the individual teacher.

#26. BUILDING ITV COORDINATOR

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	5.6	10.0	17.9	8.7
PART TIME	7.8	5.0	3.6	6.5
INFORMAL	5.6	5.0	3.6	5.0
NONE	81.1	80.0	75.0	79.7
PERSON SPECIALLY TRAINED	52.6	75.0	87.5	64.5

(1983-84 STUDY cont'd.)

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ITV COORDINATOR CONSULTS WITH TEACHERS	94.4	100.0	100.0	97.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	8.0	13.0	20.9	12.8
PART TIME	1.3	13.0	11.6	7.3
INFORMAL	16.0	13.0	4.7	12.2
NONE	74.7	60.9	62.8	67.7
PERSON SPECIALLY TRAINED	33.3	38.9	62.5	43.6
ITV COORDINATOR CONSULTS WITH TEACHERS	90.0	100.0	100.0	96.2

Results today closely parallel those of 1981. An increase in the percentage of building ITV coordinators with special training from 43.6% (1981) to 64.5% (today) is noted.

#27. CONTACT WITH OUTSIDE ITV PERSONNEL

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
CONTACTED	63.5	77.8	70.3	66.9
IF YES -				
STAFF VISITED SCHOOL				
SYSTEM	48.1	35.7	25.9	46.3
STATE	27.8	7.1	11.1	23.2
PROVIDED INSERVICE				
SYSTEM	11.1	57.1	25.9	25.6
STATE	20.4	35.7	25.9	28.0
PROVIDED MATERIALS				
SYSTEM	85.2	100.0	40.7	87.8
STATE	55.6	64.3	44.4	51.0
PHONE CONTACT				
SYSTEM	55.6	85.7	40.7	64.6
STATE	11.1	7.1	14.8	13.4

(1983-84 STUDY cont'd)

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SERVED ON COMMITTEE				
SYSTEM	3.7	21.4	7.4	8.5
STATE	5.6	21.4	27.0	13.4
OTHER				
SYSTEM	9.3	7.1	3.7	8.5
STATE	5.6	0.0	3.7	4.8

"Other" communication included:

1. Sent schedules and guides
2. Came to NW area media committee and presented program
3. Took program concerns
4. Someone spoke with media specialist
5. Awarded MITV grant
6. To clarify the missing $100.00 grant
7. Participated in MITV summer workshop for 1983, and Critique Week
8. Inservice speakers
9. Conference program
10. Visited Ch. 22 (Mr. Gunther)

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
CONTACTED	26.7	43.2	56.8	39.3
IF YES -				
SYSTEM	6.3	11.1	39.1	21.1
STATE	12.5	0.0	18.8	11.8
PROVIDED INSERVICE				
SYSTEM	18.8	11.1	26.1	19.3
STATE	62.5	20.0	18.8	29.4
PROVIDED MATERIALS				
SYSTEM	81.3	83.3	87.0	84.2
STATE	62.5	70.0	87.5	76.5
PHONE CONTACT				
SYSTEM	31.3	88.9	69.6	64.9
STATE	12.5	10.0	6.3	8.8

(1980-81 STUDY cont'd)

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
SERVED ON COMMITTEE				
SYSTEM	0.0	0.0	13.0	5.3
STATE	0.0	0.0	6.3	2.9
OTHER				
SYSTEM	12.5	11.1	13.0	12.3
STATE	37.5	10.0	0.0	11.8

There was an overall increase in the amount of contact between school library media specialists and personnel at the state and system levels.

#28. ITV SCHEDULE INFORMATION

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MITV MONITOR	51.6	55.0	55.2	52.9
MITV CATALOG/ SCHEDULE	94.5	95.0	89.7	93.6
SEE BOARD	1.1	0.0	6.9	2.1
OTHER	3.3	1.0	6.9	5.0
DIFFICULTY	2.2	0.0	6.9	2:9

"Other" sources of information included:

1. Word of mouth
2. I.M.C. announcements & flyers
3. School system film catalog listing
4. Calling station
5. Librarian's meetings
6. We don't use it
7. Cable Guide

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

#29. TEACHER GUIDE DISTRIBUTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL	31.5	20.0	25.9	28.7
GIVEN ON REQUEST	41.6	50.0	22.2	38.9
NOT PROVIDED	1.1	0.0	3.7	1.5
COPIES IN SCHOOL	25.8	30.0	48.1	30.9
DON'T KNOW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL	22.1	6.4	4.8	13.3
GIVEN ON REQUEST	49.4	42.6	38.1	44.6
NOT PROVIDED	1.3	2.1	4.8	2.4
COPIES IN SCHOOL	18.2	29.8	35.7	25.9
DON'T KNOW	3.9	6.4	4.8	4.8
MORE THAN ONE WAY	5.2	12.8	11.9	9.0

UTILIZATION OF ITV

#30. WHO INFORMS TEACHERS ABOUT ITV?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	87.9	85.0	89.7	87.9
ITV COORDINATOR	24.2	25.0	27.6	25.0
ANOTHER TEACHER	14.3	30.0	17.2	17.1
PRINCIPAL	18.7	15.0	3.4	15.0
ITV-STATE	16.5	15.0	13.8	15.7
LOCAL TV STATION	1.1	0.0	3.4	1.4
NO ONE	3.3	5.0	6.9	4.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	83.3	87.2	86.4	85.2
ITV COORDINATOR	15.4	12.8	20.5	16.0
ANOTHER TEACHER	15.4	10.6	18.2	14.8
PRINCIPAL	12.8	10.6	2.3	9.5
ITV--STATE	14.1	4.3	15.9	11.8
LOCAL TV STATION	0.0	4.3	2.3	1.8
NO ONE	12.8	6.4	2.3	8.3

#31. MEDIA SPECIALISTS' SUGGESTIONS ABOUT ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
OFTEN	21.1	30.0	34.5	25.2
SOMETIMES	63.3	60.0	48.3	59.7
RARELY	12.2	0.0	13.8	10.8
NEVER	3.3	10.0	3.4	4.3

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
OFTEN	17.9	42.6	34.1	29.0
SOMETIMES	50.0	46.8	47.7	48.5
RARELY	21.8	10.6	13.6	16.6
NEVER	10.3	0.0	4.5	5.9

The total percentage of library media specialists who reported that they rarely or never give advice on program viewing was 15.1%. This shows a slight decline from the 1980-81 study from 22.4%.

#32. GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD ITV

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
CHAIRS/SUBJECT SPECIALISTS:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	46.2	65.0	57.7	52.2
NEUTRAL	53.8	35.0	38.5	46.8
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	3.8	1.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	63.3	51.3	48.8	53.6
NEUTRAL	33.3	48.7	51.2	45.5
AGAINST	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.9

TEACHERS:	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	72.2	70.0	46.2	66.9
NEUTRAL	26.7	30.0	53.8	32.4
AGAINST	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	73.6	47.7	51.2	60.4
NEUTRAL	23.6	52.3	48.8	38.4
AGAINST	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.3

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PRINCIPALS:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	65.2	63.2	50.0	61.9
NEUTRAL	31.5	31.6	50.0	35.1
AGAINST	3.4	5.3	0.0	3.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	68.6	70.5	57.1	66.0 (*4.4)
NEUTRAL	27.1	27.3	40.5	30.8
AGAINST	4.3	2.3	2.4	3.2

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
OTHER SPECIALISTS:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	50.0	50.0	34.6	46.4
NEUTRAL	50.0	50.0	65.4	53.6
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	63.8	40.5	44.7	50.8 (*4.8)
NEUTRAL	34.0	56.8	55.3	47.5
AGAINST	2.1	2.7	0.0	1.6

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PARENTS:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	29.2	18.8	20.8	25.9
NEUTRAL	70.8	81.3	79.2	74.1
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	34.4	23.3	23.1	28.0 (*3.9)
NEUTRAL	63.9	76.7	76.9	71.3
AGAINST	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.7

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STUDENTS:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	76.8	80.0	56.0	73.2
NEUTRAL	23.2	20.0	44.0	26.8
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
FAVOR	81.8	74.4	57.5	73.2 (*3.6)
NEUTRAL	18.2	25.6	42.5	26.8
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION:				
1983-84 STUDY:				
FAVOR	54.1	26.7	25.0	43.0
NEUTRAL	45.9	73.3	75.0	57.0
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY:

FAVOR	55.6	31.7	35.9	42.5 (*4.5)
NEUTRAL	42.6	68.3	61.5	56.0
AGAINST	1.9	0.0	2.6	1.5

#33. INAPPROPRIATE USE OF ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USED ITV TOO MUCH				
YES	12.2	25.0	28.6	17.4
NO	78.9	75.0	60.7	74.6
NOT SURE	8.9	0.0	10.7	8.0
USED INAPPROPRIATELY				
YES	10.0	25.0	24.1	15.1
NO	76.7	70.0	62.1	72.7
NOT SURE	13.3	5.0	13.8	12.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
USED ITV TOO MUCH				
YES	15.1	4.4	7.1	10.0
NO	78.1	88.9	92.9	85.0
NOT SURE	6.8	6.7	0.0	5.0
USED INAPPROPRIATELY				
YES	11.3	13.0	11.9	11.9
NO	77.5	73.9	83.3	78.0
NOT SURE	11.3	13.0	4.8	10.1

#34. MAXIMUM APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF ITV PER WEEK

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FIFTEEN MIN.	6.7	10.0	13.8	8.7
THIRTY MIN.	15.7	25.0	13.8	16.7
ONE HOUR	31.5	40.0	6.9	27.5
ONE & ONE HALF HR.	13.5	5.0	20.7	13.8
TWO TO FOUR HRS.	5.6	10.0	3.5	5.8

(1983-84 STUDY cont'd.)

FIVE OR MORE HRS.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NO SET LIMIT	27.0	10.0	41.4	27.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FIFTEEN MIN.	0.0	4.3	0.0	1.2
THIRTY MIN.	17.3	23.9	9.5	17.2
ONE HOUR	32.0	21.7	33.3	29.4
ONE & ONE HALF HR.	21.3	10.9	16.7	17.2
TWO TO FOUR HRS.	12.0	6.5	4.8	8.6
FIVE OR MORE HRS.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NO SET LIMIT	17.3	32.6	35.7	26.4

Results from this item correspond closely to that obtained in the 1980-81 study.

#35. ITV SERIES TEACHERS ARE USING OR HAVE USED

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	Present	Past	Present	Past	Present	Past
Art						
Art Cart (The)	9.9	7.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Primary Art	12.1	15.4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Career Education						
Jobs: Seeking, Finding, Keeping	3.3	12.1	25.0	25.0	55.2	37.9
Consumer Education						
Consumer Connection	1.1	1.1	15.0	5.0	24.1	20.7
Consumer Squad	3.3	5.5	50.0	30.0	13.8	20.7
Economic Education						
Give and Take	1.1	2.2	10.0	5.0	13.8	13.8
Trade-Offs	2.2	6.6	5.0	10.0	3.4	3.4
Environmental Education						
Terra: Our World	14.3	9.9	30.0	25.0	10.3	13.8
Health Education						
All About You	30.8	27.5	5.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Inside Story with Slim Goodbody (The)	37.4	22.0	40.0	0.0	3.4	3.4

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	Present	Past	Present	Past	Present	Past
Jackson Junior High	3.3	3.3	20.0	10.0	0.0	10.3
Mulligan Stew	30.8	34.1	20.0	15.0	0.0	3.4
On The Level	1.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Language Arts						
Media Machine (The)	7.7	6.6	15.0	5.0	10.3	10.3
Stories Without Words	27.5	28.6	15.0	10.0	0.0	3.4
Write Channel (The)	17.6	14.3	15.0	15.0	3.4	3.4
Young Filmmakers (The)	8.8	16.5	10.0	15.0	10.3	13.8
Mathematics						
Adventure of the Mind	5.5	4.4	25.0	15.0	6.9	3.4
Counterplot	6.6	4.4	20.0	10.0	3.4	3.4
It Figures	12.1	4.4	20.0	5.0	3.4	0.0
Landscape of Geometry	0.0	2.2	5.0	0.0	6.9	0.0
Mathematical Relationships	3.3	5.5	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mathways	2.2	4.4	10.0	10.0	3.4	0.0
Numbers Game II	13.2	17.6	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
Music						
Let's All Sing	9.9	13.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Music and Me	3.3	3.3	5.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
Song Bag (The)	29.7	26.4	10.0	15.0	3.4	0.0
Reading						
Book, Look, and Listen	58.2	53.8	15.0	15.0	3.4	3.4
Contract!	8.8	6.6	20.0	10.0	3.4	6.9
From the Brothers Grimm	46.2	6.6	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Once Upon a Town	37.4	41.8	25.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
Read All About It! I	35.2	27.5	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Read All About It! II	26.4	22.0	20.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
Readalong	23.1	28.6	5.0	10.0	0.0	3.4
Readers' Cube	25.3	22.0	45.0	50.0	3.4	24.1
Readit	34.1	6.6	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	Present	Past	Present	Past	Present	Past
Safety Education						
Afloat and Aboat	16.5	14.3	20.0	15.0	6.9	3.4
Way To Go	11.0	14.3	5.0	0.0	3.4	3.4
Science						
Bioscope	4.4	1.1	25.0	5.0	17.2	6.9
Community of Living Things	7.7	8.8	25.0	5.0	3.4	3.4
Dimensions in Science: Chemistry	1.1	1.1	15.0	10.0	34.5	27.6
Dimensions in Science: Physics	2.2	1.1	15.0	10.0	34.5	27.6
Exploring the World of Science	35.2	26.4	10.0	10.0	6.9	0.0
Many Worlds of Nature (The)	14.3	8.8	20.0	0.0	10.3	3.4
Real World of Insects (The)	15.4	13.2	25.0	5.0	10.3	3.4
Up Close and Natural	17.6	5.5	10.0	10.0	3.4	0.0
Universe and I	4.4	4.4	15.0	10.0	10.3	10.3
Social Studies						
Across Cultures	9.9	2.2	20.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
American Scrapbook	13.2	17.6	25.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Assignment: The World	11.0	3.3	15.0	5.0	6.9	6.9
By The People	0.0	2.2	15.0	0.0	20.7	17.2
Comparative Geography	2.2	1.1	15.0	5.0	3.4	0.0
Finding Our Way	6.6	3.3	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Here and There in Maryland	58.2	44.0	35.0	25.0	13.8	17.2
Maryland	51.6	31.9	25.0	15.0	10.3	17.2
Ripples	18.7	19.8	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.4
Truly American	25.3	20.9	30.0	15.0	3.4	3.4
Under the Blue Umbrella	27.5	16.5	5.0		3.4	0.0
Under the Yellow Balloon	23.1	13.2	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4

SERIES TITLE	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE		HIGH	
	Present	Past	Present	Past	Present	Past
High School Equivalency						
General Educational Development	0.0	2.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Specials						
Interludes	7.7	4.4	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Special Programming Hour	12.1	3.3	20.0	0.0	10.3	3.4
State Education Events (SEE) Board	2.2	1.1	5.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Teleconferences	1.1	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Inservice Education						
Interaction: Human Concerns in the Schools	0.0	3.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Teaching Students with Special Needs (Secondary Level)	2.2	1.1	15.0	10.0	3.4	6.9
Teaching Writing: A Process Approach	5.5	2.2	20.0	5.0	3.4	10.3

The 1980-81 report did not include statistics regarding teacher utilization of ITV series.

#36. PROGRAM NEEDS DURING THE NEXT 3 YEARS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1) Art	5.5	5.0	17.2	7.9
2) Career/Vocational Ed.	9.9	0.0	41.4	15.0
3) Foreign Language	7.7	0.0	27.6	10.7
4) Home Economics	3.3	5.0	13.8	5.7
5) Industrial Education	1.1	15.0	17.2	6.4
6) Language Arts (other than reading)	22.0	10.0	31.0	22.1
7) Math	13.2	5.0	20.7	13.6

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
8)	Music	8.8	10.0	10.3	16.4
9)	Physical/Health Education	9.9	5.0	24.1	12.1
10)	Reading	22.0	10.0	17.2	19.3
11)	Science	23.1	10.0	37.9	24.3
12)	Social Studies	28.6	10.0	44.8	29.3
13)	Special Ed.	9.9	0.0	6.9	7.9
14)	Other	5.5	0.0	6.9	5.0

"Other" needs included:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL:

ART
1. Holiday crafts
2. Cartoon design
3. History

CAREER/VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1. Computer jobs and training
2. World of technology-Computers
3. Samples of general categories & Community Helpers
4. Curriculum oriented

FOREIGN LANGUAGE
1. Every aspect of foreign language
2. French, German, Italy, Spain - cross cultures
3. Intro to Spanish
4. French, Spanish
5. Latin, French, Spanish, German
6. French and Latin

HOME ECONOMICS
1. Banking, Savings, Taxes
2. Preparing simple foods

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION
1. Modernization of industrial plants

LANGUAGE ARTS (other than reading)
1. Grammar
2. Shows on "illustrators" only
3. Writing reports
4. Literature
5. Electric Company format
6. Listening skills
7. Afro-American tales, tall tales
8. Grammar and Written composition
9. Writing-letters, stories
10. Listening
11. Creative Writing
12. Fairytales

MATH
1. Simple concepts
2. Computers
3. Metric system
4. Lots of visuals to get concepts
5. Computer literacy

MUSIC
1. Foreign folk songs
2. Holiday songs and activities
3. Appreciation

PHYSICAL/HEALTH EDUCATION
1. Body care and junk food
2. Herpes/other VD
3. Sport biographies
4. Health
5. Health
6. Health

READING
1. Emphasis on Public Libraries
2. More like Readit
3. Study skills, writing, motivating, reading
4. Classics
5. Reviewing new books
6. Literature and reading
7. Contemporary stories
8. New books
9. Stories on novels
10. Individual interest

SCIENCE
1. Space science , ecology
2. Various science experiments
3. Simple experiments
4. Exploring world of Science
5. Animals, senses, earth/moon, planets, nutrition

SOCIAL STUDIES
1. People from other lands, government
2. Eco-system
3. U.S. history
4. Maryland, westward movement
5. Field trips - around Maryland
6. Neighborhood, Map reading
7. Update Maryland programs
8. Community workers, Africa, early civilization, American history
9. Vandalism, drugs, sex education
10. U.S. history, ancient history
11. Shelter and clothing - For MCPS Curriculum
12. Government
13. Mexico, Canada, U.S., South America
14. Man and his changing world
15. Civics, law
16. American History
17. Westward expansion, Post Civil War

SPECIAL EDUCATION
1. Understanding people - differences
2. Basic language skills
3. Language arts, Math
4. Reading Readiness

OTHER
1. Foreign language - simple phrases
2. Literacy in computers
3. Media research skills
4. Library skills, study skills
5. Reference work - especially using magazines
6. Library skills

MIDDLE SCHOOL LEVEL:

CAREER/VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1. New jobs created by high tech
2. Trainable retarded work-attitudes

LANGUAGE ARTS (other than reading)
1. Reference skills
2. Storytelling
3. Storytelling
4. Folklore and Myths

MATH
1. Basic skills

PHYSICAL/HEALTH EDUCATION
1. Nutrition and Exercise

READING
1. Basic Skills
2. More series like Robin Hood

SCIENCE
1. Physical Sciences
2. Metrics

SOCIAL STUDIES
1. American history, Citizenship

SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL:

ART
1. Art history
2. Photography
3. Demonstrations-photo, film, video

CAREER/VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1. Exploring the world of work
2. Computer Literacy, Word Processing
3. General Job Seeking
4. Resume writing
5. Special education

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

1. Culture & foods (Spanish & French)
2. Foreign language dialogs - French & Spanish
3. Conversation - cartoons
4. Conversational situations
5. Conversational skills
6. Scenarios, plays, stories, etc.

HOME ECONOMICS

1. Sewing, cooking
2. Nutrition, housing, sewing skills, parenting
3. Family life

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

1. Basic electronics, woodworking, drafting
2. Carpentry
3. Cosmotology

LANGUAGE ARTS (other than reading)

1. Functional writing skills
2. Writing skills
3. Speech & diction pointers, Literature selections dramatized
4. Book reviews (Young Adult)
5. Shakespeare
6. Reference, Research Papers
7. Library skills
8. Shakespeare, Speeches

MATH

1. Calculus
2. Calculus II, III
3. More advanced computer related programs
4. Current subjects
5. Mathematics in careers

MUSIC

1. Vocal techniques
2. Theory

PHYSICAL/HEALTH EDUCATION

1. Drug education
2. Demonstration game techniques
3. Herpes and drug education
4. Gymnastics
5. Aerobics

READING

1. Current fiction
2. Reading/Study skills
3. Book reviews
4. New Reader's Cube, Classics, Shakespeare

SCIENCE

1. Chemistry, Physics-Force & Movement
2. Chemistry, Physics, General Science
3. Biology
4. New findings
5. Oceanography
6. Electronics
7. Oceanography, Biology, Anatomy

SOCIAL STUDIES

1. Humanities course, Renaissance
2. News-Up to date
3. Contemporary issues
4. Current Issues
5. Social problems, Ethics
6. Current social problems
7. 1910-40
8. Current Events
9. Geography, Maryland
10. U.S. history, World history
11. Geography, Graph skills, map skills
12. Current events, Government, Political campaigns

SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. Low vocabulary, high interest stories
2. Occupation skills

OTHER

1. Computer literacy
2. Graphics communication, Vo-Tech Subjects

#37. AWARENESS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMING

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SPECIAL PROGRAMMING HOUR				
YES	52.2	60.0	69.0	56.8
NO	47.8	40.0	31.0	43.2
SEE BOARD				
YES	36.8	44.4	58.6	42.5
NO	63.2	55.6	41.4	57.5

There was no corresponding item in the 1980-81 study.

LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS' PREPARATION FOR USE OF ITV

#38. TRAINING IN THE USE OF ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	48.9	55.0	70.3	51.8
IF YES -				
COLLEGE COURSEWORK	32.6	45.5	36.8	35.6
SYSTEM INSERVICE	62.8	63.6	68.4	64.4
TV INSERVICE	16.3	0.0	10.5	12.3
WORKSHOP-TV STATION	7.0	0.0	5.3	5.5
SDE INSERVICE	46.5	45.5	47.4	46.6
WORKSHOP - PROF MEETING	58.1	18.2	47.4	49.3
NONE	4.7	0.0	5.3	4.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	42.1	55.3	62.8	51.2
IF YES -				
COLLEGE COURSEWORK	45.7	46.2	55.6	48.9
SYSTEM INSERVICE	42.9	42.3	51.9	45.5
TV INSERVICE	11.4	11.5	7.4	10.2
WORKSHOP - TV STATION	0.0	3.8	0.0	1.1
SDE INSERVICE	28.6	23.1	18.5	23.9
WORKSHOP - PROF. MEETING	45.7	57.7	37.0	46.6

#39. RECENT TRAINING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
WITHIN THREE YEARS	47.5	64.3	73.9	56.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
WITHIN THREE YEARS	42.5	29.0	43.8	38.8

The present study reveals an increase in the number of library media specialists who have had training within the past three years from 38.8% in 1980-81 to 56.1% today.

REACTIONS TO USE OF ITV

#40. PERCEPTIONS OF ITV

A. Teachers in my school are using more ITV than they have in the past 3 years.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	40.6	57.9	40.7	43.6
NEITHER	3.1	26.3	22.2	11.8
DISAGREE	39.1	15.8	29.6	32.7
NA	17.2	0.0	7.4	11.8
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	29.2	38.6	45.0	35.9
NEITHER	31.9	18.2	25.0	26.3
DISAGREE	29.2	36.4	22.5	29.5
NA	9.7	6.8	7.5	8.3

B. ITV causes many scheduling and administrative problems.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	24.7	52.6	34.6	30.8
NEITHER	17.6	5.3	11.5	14.6
DISAGREE	45.9	42.1	50.0	46.2
NA	11.8	0.0	3.8	8.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	28.4	26.7	26.8	27.5
NEITHER	27.0	22.2	17.1	23.1
DISAGREE	39.2	46.7	43.9	42.5
NA	5.4	4.4	12.2	6.9

C. ITV is a useful teaching tool.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	90.7	94.7	84.6	90.0
NEITHER	5.9	5.3	7.7	6.1
DISAGREE	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.8
NA	3.5	0.0	3.8	3.1
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	91.8	93.2	95.2	93.1
NEITHER	6.8	2.3	2.4	4.4
DISAGREE	1.4	2.3	0.0	1.3
NA	0.0	2.3	2.4	1.3

D. Teachers don't make enough use of ITV.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	58.8	61.1	59.3	59.2
NEITHER	23.5	11.1	18.5	20.8
DISAGREE	11.8	22.2	14.8	13.8
NA	5.9	5.6	7.4	6.2
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	61.1	73.8	59.5	64.1
NEITHER	27.8	16.7	31.0	25.6
DISAGREE	11.1	2.4	4.8	7.1
NA	0.0	7.1	4.8	3.2

E. If teachers in my school used ITV too much, there would be comments.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	51.2	55.6	34.6	48.5
NEITHER	22.1	33.3	34.6	26.2
DISAGREE	12.8	5.6	26.9	14.6
NA	14.0	5.6	3.8	10.8

1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	31.0	48.8	35.0	37.0
NEITHER	35.2	23.3	37.5	32.5
DISAGREE	19.7	14.0	20.0	18.2
NA	14.1	14.0	7.5	12.3

F. Some parents express concerns about the amount of ITV watched in the classroom.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	4.6	0.0	11.5	5.3
NEITHER	24.1	36.8	23.1	25.8
DISAGREE	48.3	42.1	46.2	16.7
NA	23.0	21.1	19.2	22.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	5.5	4.7	5.0	5.1
NEITHER	34.2	18.6	20.0	26.3
DISAGREE	43.8	60.5	50.0	50.0
NA	16.4	16.3	25.0	18.6

G. Our emphasis on basic education goals makes ITV a frill.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	3.4	0.0	7.7	3.8
NEITHER	21.8	21.1	15.4	20.5
DISAGREE	65.5	78.9	69.2	68.2
NA	9.2	0.0	7.7	7.6
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	8.5	8.9	5.0	7.7
NEITHER	25.4	13.3	27.5	22.4
DISAGREE	60.6	73.3	57.5	63.5
NA	5.6	4.4	10.0	6.4

H. I have inquired about ITV opinions of parents in a needs-assessment survey.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NEITHER	10.6	12.5	3.8	9.4
DISAGREE	23.5	43.8	38.5	29.1
NA	65.9	43.8	57.7	61.4

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.7
NEITHER	8.7	9.8	18.9	11.6
DISAGREE	31.9	41.5	16.2	30.6
NA	59.4	48.8	62.2	57.1

I. One of the first things to go in a tight budgetary environment is ITV.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	14.1	22.2	26.9	17.8
NEITHER	28.2	44.4	30.8	31.0
DISAGREE	38.8	22.2	34.6	35.7
NA	18.8	11.1	7.7	15.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	24.3	27.3	35.0	27.9
NEITHER	50.0	38.6	32.5	42.2
DISAGREE	15.7	27.3	20.0	20.1
NA	10.0	6.8	12.5	9.7

J. It has become easier over the past 3 years to justify funds for supporting ITV.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	20.2	33.3	36.0	25.2
NEITHER	50.0	55.6	32.0	47.2
DISAGREE	13.1	0.0	16.0	11.8
NA	16.7	11.1	16.0	15.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	6.9	24.4	10.0	12.7
NEITHER	52.8	31.1	62.5	49.0
DISAGREE	23.6	33.3	15.0	24.2
NA	16.7	11.1	12.5	14.0

#41. USES OF ITV

A. To extend the range of experiences available to students

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	94.4	94.4	86.2	92.7
NEITHER	3.3	5.6	10.3	5.1
UNIMPORTANT	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
NA	1.1	0.0	3.4	1.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	94.7	91.3	93.0	93.3
NEITHER	3.9	4.3	4.7	4.2
UNIMPORTANT	1.3	2.2	2.3	1.8
NA	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.6

B. To present new material

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	77.5	85.0	85.7	80.3
NEITHER	13.5	10.0	3.6	10.9
UNIMPORTANT	7.9	5.0	7.1	7.3
NA	1.1	0.0	3.6	1.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	83.1	75.6	76.7	79.2
NEITHER	11.3	20.0	18.6	15.7
UNIMPORTANT	4.2	2.2	4.7	3.8
NA	1.4	2.2	0.0	1.3

C. To provide different approaches for presenting material

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	92.0	95.0	89.7	92.0
NEITHER	6.8	5.0	6.9	6.6
UNIMPORTANT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NA	1.1	0.0	3.4	1.5

1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	93.3	90.9	92.7	92.5
NEITHER	5.3	6.8	4.9	5.6
UNIMPORTANT	1.3	0.0	2.4	1.3
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

D. To reinforce material taught in other lessons

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	90.9	78.9	92.9	89.6
NEITHER	8.0	21.1	3.6	8.9
UNIMPORTANT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NA	1.1	0.0	3.6	1.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	86.3	79.1	82.9	83.4
NEITHER	13.7	14.0	14.6	14.0
UNIMPORTANT	0.0	4.7	2.4	1.9
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

E. To bring new resources and/or persons into the classroom

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	93.2	100.0	96.4	94.8
NEITHER	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.0
UNIMPORTANT	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
NA	1.1	0.0	3.6	1.5
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	95.9	95.6	86.0	93.2
NEITHER	2.7	2.2	14.0	5.6
UNIMPORTANT	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
NA	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.6

F. To motivate students' interest in a subject

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	94.4	94.7	93.1	94.2
NEITHER	3.4	5.3	0.0	2.9
UNIMPORTANT	1.1	0.0	3.4	1.5
NA	1.1	0.0	3.4	1.5

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	94.5	85.4	88.1	90.4
NEITHER	4.1	12.2	11.9	8.3
UNIMPORTANT	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
NA	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.6

G. To lighten the teaching load

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	19.3	21.1	14.3	18.5
NEITHER	27.3	31.6	21.4	26.7
UNIMPORTANT	42.0	31.6	50.0	42.2
NA	11.4	15.8	14.3	12.6
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	13.7	4.5	9.8	10.1
NEITHER	30.1	29.5	34.1	31.0
UNIMPORTANT	45.2	50.0	48.8	47.5
NA	11.0	15.9	7.3	11.4

H. To allow teacher to observe students

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	19.5	31.6	28.6	23.1
NEITHER	36.8	36.8	32.1	35.8
UNIMPORTANT	33.3	26.3	32.1	32.1
NA	10.3	5.3	7.1	9.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	29.2	15.9	21.4	23.4
NEITHER	25.0	45.5	47.6	36.7
UNIMPORTANT	37.5	31.8	23.8	32.3
NA	8.3	6.8	7.1	7.6

I. To allow student and/or teacher a brief time to relax

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	12.6	5.3	3.7	9.8
NEITHER	21.8	15.8	18.5	20.3
UNIMPORTANT	46.0	57.9	66.7	51.9
NA	19.5	21.1	11.1	18.0

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	9.1	2.3	7.1	6.6
NEITHER	22.7	25.0	38.1	27.6
UNIMPORTANT	54.5	65.9	50.0	56.6
NA	13.6	6.8	4.8	9.2

J. To permit individualization of instruction

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	43.7	42.1	57.1	46.3
NEITHER	28.7	47.4	21.4	29.9
UNIMPORTANT	11.5	5.3	7.1	9.7
NA	16.1	5.3	14.3	14.2
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	48.6	48.8	74.4	55.8
NEITHER	27.1	25.6	18.6	24.4
UNIMPORTANT	11.4	11.6	4.7	9.6
NA	12.9	14.0	2.3	10.3

K. To present subject matter where there is not a special teacher

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	60.9	30.0	55.6	44.0
NEITHER	14.9	25.0	18.5	26.1
UNIMPORTANT	6.9	0.0	14.8	10.4
NA	17.2	45.0	11.1	19.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	61.1	41.9	45.2	51.6
NEITHER	19.4	9.3	19.0	16.6
UNIMPORTANT	8.3	30.2	9.5	14.6
NA	11.1	18.6	26.2	17.2

L. To serve as a suitable teaching alternative in emergency situations

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	19.8	15.0	32.1	21.6
NEITHER	19.8	35.0	21.4	22.4
UNIMPORTANT	34.9	20.0	32.1	32.1
NA	25.6	30.0	14.3	23.9

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	10.0	13.6	14.3	12.2
NEITHER	21.4	20.5	26.2	22.4
UNIMPORTANT	51.4	47.7	42.9	48.1
NA	17.1	18.2	16.7	17.3

M. To cover essential learning skills

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	51.7	40.0	60.7	51.8
NEITHER	21.3	40.0	17.9	23.4
UNIMPORTANT	13.5	5.0	17.9	13.1
NA	13.5	15.0	3.6	11.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
IMPORTANT	38.9	46.5	57.1	45.9
NEITHER	34.7	27.9	28.6	31.2
UNIMPORTANT	18.1	18.6	9.5	15.9
NA	8.3	7.0	4.8	7.0

#42. VARIOUS ASPECTS OF ITV

A. ITV shows great possibilities for stimulating teacher creativity.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	56.2	50.0	72.4	58.7
NEITHER	38.2	45.0	13.8	34.1
DISAGREE	4.5	5.0	13.8	6.5
NA	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	65.8	63.6	56.1	62.7
NEITHER	23.3	27.3	39.0	28.5
DISAGREE	6.8	6.8	2.4	5.7
NA	4.1	2.3	2.4	3.2

B. Teachers, when using instructional television, lose some of their importance in the classroom setting.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	2.2	0.0	10.3	3.6
NEITHER	18.9	25.0	27.6	21.6
DISAGREE	77.8	70.0	62.1	73.4
NA	1.1	5.0	0.0	1.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	2.8	2.3	9.3	4.4
NEITHER	13.9	11.4	23.3	15.7
DISAGREE	83.3	84.1	67.4	79.2
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

C. The personal relationship between student and teacher is lost when instructional television is used.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	6.6	0.0	0.0	4.3
NEITHER	11.0	21.1	3.4	10.8
DISAGREE	80.2	78.9	96.6	83.5
NA	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.4
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	12.5	4.5	9.3	9.4
NEITHER	11.1	13.6	23.3	15.1
DISAGREE	73.6	77.3	65.1	72.3
NA	2.8	4.5	2.3	3.1

D. The development of more new instructional programs is a waste of time.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NEITHER	14.3	10.5	3.4	11.4
DISAGREE	85.7	89.5	96.6	88.6
NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	2.8	2.3	0.0	1.9
NEITHER	11.1	6.8	11.9	10.1
DISAGREE	86.1	88.6	88.1	87.3
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

E. Wider use of instructional television is needed.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	52.3	63.2	75.9	58.8
NEITHER	35.2	36.8	20.7	32.4
DISAGREE	12.5	0.0	3.4	8.8
NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	53.4	58.1	61.9	57.0
NEITHER	32.9	37.2	33.3	34.2
DISAGREE	13.7	2.3	4.8	8.2
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

F. The use of instructional television makes any subject matter more interesting.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	60.5	52.6	51.7	57.5
NEITHER	30.2	31.6	37.9	32.1
DISAGREE	9.3	10.5	10.3	9.7
NA	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.7
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	52.7	44.2	53.5	50.6
NEITHER	37.8	32.6	32.6	35.0
DISAGREE	9.5	20.9	14.0	13.7
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

G. Instructional television should inspire students to greater curiosity and learning.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	78.7	84.2	82.8	80.3
NEITHER	20.2	15.8	17.2	19.0
DISAGREE	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	82.2	81.8	83.7	82.5
NEITHER	17.9	13.6	16.3	16.2
DISAGREE	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

H. Instructional television is all right, but I feel it has been overemphasized.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	6.9	5.3	13.8	8.1
NEITHER	32.2	31.6	34.5	32.6
DISAGREE	60.9	63.2	51.7	59.3
NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	2.7	6.8	2.3	3.8
NEITHER	39.7	29.5	37.2	36.2
DISAGREE	57.5	61.4	60.5	59.4
NA	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6

I. Children watch enough television at home; they don't need to watch more in school.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:				
AGREE	5.9	0.0	3.4	4.5
NEITHER	20.0	26.3	24.1	21.8
DISAGREE	72.9	63.2	72.4	71.4
NA	1.2	10.5	0.0	2.3

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1980-81 STUDY:				
AGREE	4.1	2.3	0.0	2.5
NEITHER	18.9	27.3	23.3	22.4
DISAGREE	73.0	65.9	76.7	72.0
NA	4.1	4.5	0.0	3.1

#43. MAINTAINING AN ITV BUDGET

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MUCH HARDER	12.2	17.6	14.3	13.4
HARDER	24.3	5.9	17.9	20.2
NO DIFFERENCE	60.8	76.5	64.3	63.9
EASIER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MUCH EASIER	2.7	0.0	3.6	2.5

No results were reported for this item in the 1980-81 study.

#44. TIME SPENT ON ITV

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FAIR	3.5	5.9	6.9	4.6
MODERATE	16.5	17.6	20.7	17.6
LITTLE	47.1	64.7	44.8	48.9
NONE	32.9	11.8	27.6	29.0

No results were reported for this item in the 1980-81 study.

COMMENTS ON ITV

Library media specialists made the following comments:

1. No one used ITV before this year. This is my first year in this school. Through newsletters and meetings, an interest in ITV has been generated. The principal has agreed to purchase video cassette recorders for next year and blank tapes purchased. Query will be sent to teachers in Sept. asking programs they wish to tape. Teacher's guides for all programs ordered this year and are available.
2. In the course of the past three years use of the Media Center's video library and equipment has expanded to such an extent that at least a half dozen teachers incorporate some ITV series in their lesson plans.
3. I only work at this school one day a week. I do not believe you are receiving a fair evaluation from me.
4. Would a VCR help - keeping teachers from being tied in to off air schedule? We have found a big difference - positive - since PTA funded two VCRs.
5. Only one monitor in school has been major problem in program watching. New VCR has enabled taping to begin this week!
6. Our system has gone overboard in purchasing video equipment to the exclusion of everything else.
7. I think you have neglected to differentiate between elementary school and high school use. Also - in elementary school ITV coordinator & the media specialist are one and the same.
8. My unique situation was not questioned in this survey. My school has 1,200 students. We do not have enough TVs for each classroom (9 TVs) and we had 15 temporary buildings - (now 10) which have no TV hook-up at all. I have told teachers we will video tape off air for them and suggested programs but have had no response. I feel our facility and lack of color TVs (we have 2) is a deterrent.
9. Well done questionnaire - appeared to cover all facets for us!
10. My school has found that they really like the ITV programs but they have no time to watch them. The teachers try to make time for the programs but find that they can only watch a program a few weeks. Also many teachers find that the programs they would really like to use are on at the wrong times.
11. I use ITV in the library with follow-up lessons. The students look forward to the programs, Read All About It - I & II and Brothers Grimm.
12. We all enjoy the ITV programs.

13. The poor TVs in our school make the use of ITV impossible. Our TVs are very old and picture quality is very bad!

14. The major problem seems to be a lack of flexibility in scheduling. If programs were recorded on videotapes for flexible viewing, their use would increase.

15. ITV is probably the single most under utilized tool in the curriculum.

16. Our 9th grade civics program and Social Issues classes were envalued in viewing Assignment: The World this year. Students professed a better understanding of local and international politics due to this programming.

17. Since our Special Ed (4-6) teachers are the only ones on our school staff who are interested, I'd like to have more programs for them. Our antenna is now repaired so next year they might be using ITV.

18. Our administration has discouraged the use of TV for the past 5 years, thus the replies above. Before that, our program used TV a great deal, and we were the first elementary school to have a daily student broadcast each morning, as well as classroom teacher use.

19. With the coming of cable reception - possibly we can use regularly scheduled ITV programs in our school in the future. Our only use now is from videotapes on loan from the central film library.

20. I would appreciate getting this at some other time during the school year. There are too many other end of year responsibilities to take time for questionnaires now.

21. It is difficult to use ITV on a regular basis due to curriculum scheduling.

22. Some teachers refrain from using ITV because the programs are so short that they feel it isn't worth their while to set up the TV and take it back to a storage area. Sometimes they don't get the channel tuned in until 5 minutes of the program are over.

23. ITV has tremendous potential, however there is not enough quality programming for secondary (high) schools.

24. Is there a TV on each floor or in each pod (open space) in our school. There is no TV on the 3rd floor since we do not have elevators, teachers do not like the idea of finding someone to bring it upstairs.

25. Note: Our ITV is virtually entirely through cassettes, never live.

26. Item no. 36 should be expanded to include new ideas and programs. Instructional TV should be advertised on prime hour (commercial TV).

27. I do think more needs to be done with teachers on using TV programs correctly.

28. It is so hard to fit ITV into the schedule for 2 reasons
(1) Programs are not offered in the month I need to use it
(2) Scheduling is so tight that it is hard to find time to fit in even 20 minutes.

29. ITV is well produced. It holds the interest of students and enhances learning.

30. Generally speaking, these improvements are needed to increase use of ITV:

    More emphasis from Administrators
    Better communication to all school personnel about programs
    Better time for viewing (2:55 p.m. is too close to closing time)
    More training programs for school personnel
    Increased availability of materials (all kinds) to be used with ITV
    Increased availability of the TV (itself)
    Increased publicity about ITV

31. We do not receive the ITV channel in our school. The only benefit we receive from ITV is taped programs which we have to schedule through the Garrett County Resource Center of the Board of Education.

32. ITV can only be viewed in the Media Center, because of reception. If coordinators matched the skills mandated by the various departments, i.e. Language/Arts, Science/Math, the usage by teachers would increase. It would have to be a part of the on going curriculum specifically spelled out (outlined)

33. Unfortunately, our school system cannot or will not provide a proper antennae, so we are unable to make use of any on-the-air programs. The media center has even offered to subscribe to cable television, so at least one place in the school would be available for use. We were told no, that all county schools would have it or no one would benefit - consequently, there are stacks of catalogs, guides, etc. just taking up space.

34. There is a press for time to cover all that teachers are demanded to cover.
ITV might be better put to use if professionally prepared video cassettes were made of permanent programs worth keeping.
Then teachers could use them at their convenience fitting them in with their curriculum instead of vice-versa (stopping their lessons & curriculum to force a watching of the ITV program)

COMPLETION TIME

School library media specialists took an average of 20.6 minutes to complete the survey questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

Library media specialists continue to be positive and supportive toward the use of ITV. Some of the data would suggest that their overall support toward ITV has increased since the earlier study.

PRINCIPALS

INTRODUCTION

One hundred and sixty-six principals (79.4%) returned valid survey questionnaires. Because of the central role that principals fulfill in the instructional program of most schools, this high response rate was particularly gratifying.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Principals responding to the survey represented one-hundred elementary schools, twenty-two middle schools, and thirty-seven high schools. In the 1980-81 study, eighty-one elementary, forty middle/junior high, and forty-seven senior high principals responded.

Regarding the number of classroom teachers in the schools represented, high schools averaged 58.7 teachers (45.6 full-time equivalents), middle 31.6 teachers (21.6 full-time equivalents), and elementary 15.2 teachers (13.1 full-time equivalents). The number of specialists per school averaged 4.7 for high schools (3.6 full-time equivalents), 4.4 for middle schools (2.7 full-time equivalents), and 6.2 for elementary schools (4.4 full-time equivalents). The 1980-81 study did not report these statistics.

Principals described their schools as follows:

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
Self-contained classroom	72 (72%)	15 (68.1%)	26 (70.3%)	113 (71.1%)
Non-traditional, open space, etc.	15 (15%)	2 (9.1%)	2 (5.4%)	19 (11.9%)
Other	13 (13%)	5 (22.7%)	9 (24.3%)	27 (16.9%)

"Other" descriptions included:

DESCRIPTION	NO. RESPONDING
1. Combination of 1 & 2	10
2. Spec. Ed. Early Childhood Ctr.	1
3. Departmentalized	3
4. Traditional	5
5. Special level 5 public school for emotionally disturbed students	1
6. Vocational	3
7. Pre-professional arts high school	1
8. Flexible space	1
9. Semi-open space	1

10. Alternative learning center	1
11. Comprehensive high school	1
12. Special Ed School	1

No data were reported for this item in the 1980-81 study.

When asked about their experience as principals and as educators, principals responded as follows:

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL AT PRESENT SCHOOL				
1 year	17.2	5.0	11.1	14.2
2-3 years	26.3	50.0	27.8	29.7
4-6 years	27.3	25.0	13.9	23.9
7-9 years	14.2	1.0	22.2	15.5
10+ years	15.2	1.0	25.0	16.8
EDUCATOR				
1 year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2-3 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4-6 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7-9 years	0.0	4.8	0.0	2.8
10+ years	100.0	95.2	100.0	97.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR/MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL AT PRESENT SCHOOL				
1 year	21.0	12.5	12.8	16.7
2-3 years	30.9	35.0	27.7	31.0
4-6 years	22.2	32.5	31.9	27.4
7-9 years	18.5	7.5	12.8	14.3
10+ years	7.4	12.5	14.9	10.7
EDUCATOR				
1 year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2-3 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4-6 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7-9 years	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
10+ years	98.7	100.0	100.0	99.4

Maryland principals have a considerable amount of experience as educators, but they have less experience in their present schools. Only 16.8% reported having more than ten years in their present schools, while more than a third reported less than three years in their present school building. These findings are very similar to those presented in the 1980-81 report.

AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

#7. AVAILABILITY OF ITV PROGRAMMING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	96.9	81.9	91.7	93.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
AVAILABLE	98.7	89.7	95.7	95.8

Principals reported that ITV programming is available in 93.6% of the schools. Fewer middle school principals reported that ITV is available.

#8. NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF TELEVISION SETS AVAILABLE

	BLACK AND WHITE		COLOR		TOTAL	
	N	X	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$
ELEM.	384	3.9	500	5.0	884	8.9
MIDDLE	56	2.5	142	6.5	198	9.0
HIGH	123	3.3	220	5.9	343	9.3

Principals reported an average of nine sets per school. Almost 40% of the number of sets reported are black and white.

The 1980-81 study did not report these data.

#9. PRINCIPALS' ESTIMATES OF THE NUMBER OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS USING ITV

ELEM.	6.9
MIDDLE	9.3
HIGH	8.6

Most principals estimated that six or fewer teachers are using ITV. However, estimates ranged from zero to thirty regular users. These findings are consistent with those reported in the 1980-81 study which stated that 60% of principals believed that five or fewer teachers in their schools were regular ITV users.

#10. TELEVISION MEDIA AVAILABLE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DIRECT ON-AIR	81.0	90.9	83.8	83.0
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	62.0	86.4	97.3	73.6
VIDEODISC	3.0	9.0	5.4	4.4
CABLE TV	22.0	27.3	18.9	22.0
CLOSED CIRCUIT/ MASTER ANTENNA	30.0	13.6	16.2	25.2
MICROCOMPUTERS	39.0	40.9	67.6	45.9
DON'T KNOW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
DIRECT ON-AIR	90.7	86.5	83.3	87.7
CASSETTE/VIDEOTAPE	44.0	83.8	92.9	66.9
VIDEODISC	1.3	2.7	0.0	1.3
CABLE TV	8.0	16.2	9.5	10.4
CLOSED CIRCUIT/ MASTER ANTENNA	28.0	24.3	52.4	33.8
DON'T KNOW	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6

Principals reported that most schools use direct on-air broadcasts (83%) or taped programs. Very few reported that videodisc technology is available, but almost half (45.9%) reported microcomputers are available.

#11. QUALITY OF TELEVISION RECEPTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	61.0	45.5	64.9	59.7
FAIR	33.0	50.0	21.6	32.7
POOR	6.0	4.5	13.5	7.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
GOOD	66.2	76.9	57.1	66.5
FAIR	28.6	15.4	33.3	26.6
POOR	5.2	7.7	9.5	7.0

Principals reported that television reception is fair to good in most schools. This corresponds to findings in the 1980-81 study.

#12. LOCATION OF TELEVISION SETS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
CLASSROOM	58.0	50.0	35.1	51.6
CENTRAL LOCATION	28.0	13.6	27.0	25.8
AUDITORIUM	1.0	0.0	0.0	.6
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	7.0	18.2	37.8	15.7
OTHER	6.0	18.2	0.0	6.3

"Other" locations included:

LOCATION	NO. RESPONDING
Classroom	2
Team planning rooms or storage	1
Pod classroom storage	1

LOCATION	NO. RESPONDING
One set per grade-stored in hallways-one set in media	1
Stored in rooms on different floors, storage areas	1
School consists of 3 bldgs., complete assortment each bldg.	1
Classrooms and storage	1
Media center (3), classroom (2), -circulate as needed	1
Storage rooms	1
Combination of places due to open space	1
Not applicable	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
CLASSROOM	56.6	23.7	19.0	38.5
CENTRAL LOCATION	26.3	26.3	16.7	23.7
AUDITORIUM	2.6	0.0	4.8	2.6
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	7.9	26.3	42.9	21.8
OTHER	6.6	23.7	16.7	13.5

As in the 1980-81 survey, principals reported that television sets are most frequently located in classrooms, in a central storage location, or in the library media center.

#13 ARRANGEMENTS FOR TELEVISION USAGE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STUDENTS TO TV SETS	4.0	13.6	10.8	6.9
SETS TO STUDENTS	35.0	22.7	54.1	37.7
ONE OR OTHER	24.0	36.4	27.0	26.4
SETS IN CLASSROOM	37.0	27.3	8.1	28.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
STUDENTS TO TV	2.6	2.6	7.1	3.8
SETS TO STUDENTS	37.7	52.6	42.9	42.7
ONE OR OTHER	23.4	34.2	42.9	31.2
SETS IN CLASSROOM	36.4	10.5	7.1	22.3

#14. TV MONITOR CONFLICTS BETWEEN ITV USAGE AND MICROCOMPUTER USAGE

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DAILY	0.0	4.5	2.7	1.3
1 PER WEEK	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.6
2 PER MONTH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 PER SEMESTER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
RARELY	21.9	13.7	37.8	24.0
NEVER	78.1	77.3	56.8	71.7

Principals reported that conflicts between usage of TV monitors for ITV and for microcomputers are very rare or never happen. Those two responses included 95.7 percent of those who reported.

#15. LOCATION OF MICROCOMPUTERS

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MATH/SCIENCE	7.0	27.2	59.4	22.0
LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	42.0	31.8	35.1	39.0
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES	4.0	4.5	32.4	10.7
OTHER	51.0	54.5	45.9	50.3

"Other" locations included:

LOCATION	NO. RESPONDING
Computer Room	22
Classroom	20
None	20
Business	5
Spec. Ed.	4
On mobile cart	4
Media Center	3
Lab	2
Kindergarten and Pod areas	1
Moves around where needed & space is available	1
Hall	1
Attendance office	1
Math lab	1
Storage room	1
Resource room	1
Guidance	1
Admin. office	1
Various	1
Throughout the school	1
Science Dept.	1
Chapter I Room	1
One in each grade pod	1
Teaching areas 3, 4, 5 & 6	1

There seems to be little consistency as to where computers are located. Half of the principals reported they are located in "other" areas. Math/science classrooms and the library media center are locations in about 51% of all schools. High schools have microcomputers located in administrative areas more frequently than do middle or elementary schools.

#16. HOW OFTEN ARE SETS IN GOOD REPAIR?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	27.0	13.7	18.9	23.3
MOST OF THE TIME	64.0	77.3	75.7	68.6
SOME OF THE TIME	6.0	4.5	2.7	5.0
SELDOM	2.0	0.0	2.7	1.9

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
ALWAYS	34.2	30.8	26.2	31.2
MOST OF THE TIME	57.9	61.5	66.7	61.1
SOME OF THE TIME	5.3	2.6	4.8	4.5
SELDOM	2.6	5.1	2.4	3.2

Over 90% of principals in both studies reported that sets are in good condition always or most of the time.

#17. USE OF LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATE VIDEOTAPE LIBRARY

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
YES	60.8	75.0	78.4	64.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
YES	31.8	42.1	66.7	43.3

Principals' estimates of use of these programs have increased substantially since 1981.

#18. REPAIR POLICY

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
REPAIRED IN BUILDING	1.0	0.0	5.4	1.8
CENTRAL REPAIR SHOP	49.0	63.6	67.6	55.3
HIRED REPAIRMAN	21.0	13.6	18.9	19.5
NO POLICY	0.0	4.5	2.7	1.3
OTHER	28.0	13.6	5.4	20.8

"Other" policies included:

POLICY	NO. RESPONDING
Maintenance comes and repairs or takes to shop	2
Repair person comes to school	21
Repaired in bldg. by board staff	1
County employs a technician	7
Outside repair	1
Requisition	1
PTA repairs them	1
We request (but don't always receive) repair authorization	1
Repaired in bldg. by school people	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
REPAIRED IN BUILDING	3.9	5.1	2.4	3.8
CENTRAL REPAIR SHOP	60.5	64.1	88.1	68.8
HIRED REPAIRMAN	30.3	28.2	7.1	23.6
NO POLICY	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.6
OTHER	5.3	0.0	2.4	3.2

#19. TELEVISION-RELATED SERVICES

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
EARPHONES	14.0	9.1	21.6	15.1
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	21.0	13.6	16.2	22.6
TV STUDIO	10.0	13.6	16.2	15.7
TAPE LIBRARY IN SCHOOL	21.0	40.9	45.9	40.3
TAPE LIBRARY IN SYSTEM	51.0	59.1	54.1	65.4
OTHER	6.0	4.5	2.7	5.7

"Other" services included:

SERVICE	NO. RESPONDING
1. None	11
2. Portable video system	1
3. TV studio in central office	1
4. Limited videotape library	1
5. The library is used each Friday for a TV studio	1
6. Ability to broadcast-own station to community	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
EARPHONES	29.4	26.7	34.2	30.3
EASY (DIAL) ACCESS	39.2	50.0	21.2	36.1
TV STUDIO	7.8	23.3	28.9	18.5
TAPE LIBRARY IN SCHOOL	19.6	56.7	57.9	41.2
TAPE LIBRARY IN DISTRICT	62.7	60.0	78.9	67.2
OTHER	3.9	6.7	5.3	5.0

#20 SCHOOLS USING VTR'S FOR PLAYBACK AND RECORDING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USE	56.0	72.7	78.4	63.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
USE	36.4	71.8	80.0	56.4

#21 AVAILABILITY OF SOMEONE TO VIDEOTAPE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PERSON AVAILABLE	47.0	63.6	67.6	54.1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
PERSON AVAILABLE	39.6	82.4	78.4	62.9

#22 PROGRAMS PRODUCED IN SCHOOLS

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
PROGRAMS PRODUCED	40.2	60.0	65.6	63.2
PURPOSES:				
INSTRUCTIONAL	26.0	27.3	54.1	32.7
ADMINISTRATIVE	1.0	18.2	5.4	4.4
INSERVICE	16.0	22.7	13.5	16.4
STUDENT EXPERIENCE	32.0	40.9	29.7	32.7
TEACHER FEEDBACK	16.0	18.2	27.0	18.9
STUDENT FEEDBACK	23.0	40.9	35.1	28.3
OTHER	3.0	9.1	10.8	5.7

"Other" purposes included:

PURPOSE	NO. RESPONDING
1. Athletics	2
2. Own station to broadcast to community	1
3. News program weekly	1
4. Student elections, special activities & events, Phys. Ed., Music, Band practices	1
5. G & T students prepared program for parents	1
6. Review of choreography and theater	1
7. Film Festival	1

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
PROGRAMS PRODUCED	44.0	57.9	61.5	52.0
TO WHAT END:				
INSTRUCTIONAL USE	57.6	82.6	80.0	71.6
ADMINISTRATIVE USE	18.2	8.7	8.0	12.3
INSERVICE	18.2	52.2	28.0	30.9
STUDENT EXPERIENCE	72.7	78.3	72.0	74.1
TEACHER FEEDBACK	27.3	43.5	40.0	35.8
STUDENT FEEDBACK	72.2	78.3	96.0	81.5
OTHER	9.1	0.0	8.0	6.2

SUPPORT OF ITV

#23. PRINCIPAL'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS ITV USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	20.0	5.4	8.1	15.7
ENCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	61.0	40.5	78.4	66.0
NEITHER ENCOURAGE OR DISCOURAGE	17.0	10.8	8.1	15.1

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
DISCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	11.1	10.3	11.4	11.0
ENCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	69.1	76.9	65.9	70.1
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	19.8	12.8	22.7	18.9
DISCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

An average of 15.7% of principals see themselves as strong advocates of ITV. Most (66%) felt they encourage use but leave the decision up to the individual teacher. About 15% of principals see themselves as neutral. No principal felt he or she discouraged use of ITV. These findings are similar to those reported in the 1980-81 study.

#24. SYSTEM ATTITUDE TOWARDS ITV USE

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGED	52.0	18.2	5.4	36.5
ENCOURAGED/TEACHER DISCRETION	34.0	72.7	83.8	50.9
NEITHER ENCOURAGED NOR DISCOURAGED	13.0	9.1	8.1	11.3
DISCOURAGED/TEACHER DISCRETION	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STRONGLY DISCOURAGED	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
STRONGLY ENCOURAGE	11.1	10.3	8.9	10.3
ENCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	63.0	74.4	71.1	67.9
NEITHER ENCOURAGE NOR DISCOURAGE	25.9	15.4	20.0	21.8
DISCOURAGE/TEACHER DISCRETION	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STRONGLY DISCOURAGE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

In both studies, system attitudes toward ITV were perceived by principals to be very similar to their own attitudes.

#25. BUILDING ITV COORDINATOR

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	34.0	40.9	18.9	31.4
PART TIME	20.0	18.2	24.3	20.6
INFORMAL	25.0	13.6	29.7	24.5
NONE	17.0	27.3	27.0	20.8
SPECIAL TRAINING	76.0	92.9	88.9	81.0
CONSULT WITH TEACHERS	92.9	92.3	100.0	93.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
FULL TIME	33.3	35.0	17.8	29.5
PART TIME	13.6	12.5	22.2	15.7
INFORMAL	32.1	30.0	28.9	30.7
NONE	21.0	22.5	31.1	24.1
SPECIAL TRAINING	78.3	80.6	83.9	80.3
CONSULTS WITH TEACHERS	89.7	100.0	89.7	92.4

Principals reported that 20.8% of the schools do not have an ITV coordinator. In schools which do have coordinators, they are perceived as being well trained and as consulting with classroom teachers. These findings are consistent with those reported in the 1980-81 study.

#26. ·CONTACT WITH OUTSIDE ITV PERSONNEL

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
STAFF VISIT				
SYSTEM	16.0	13.6	21.6	17.0
STATE	4.0	0.0	10.8	5.3
INSERVICE				
SYSTEM	14.0	13.6	10.8	13.2
STATE	5.0	4.5	8.2	5.7
NEWSLETTERS, ETC.				
SYSTEM	37.0	27.3	32.4	34.6
STATE	33.0	36.4	37.8	34.6
TELEPHONE				
SYSTEM	17.0	9.1	13.5	15.8
STATE	2.0	4.5	8.1	3.8
SERVED ON COMMITTEE				
SYSTEM	3.0	4.5	5.4	3.8
STATE	1.0	4.5	5.4	2.5
OTHER				
SYSTEM	1.0	0.0	2.7	1.3
STATE	1.0	0.0	5.4	1.9

"Other" contacts included:

1. Area principals' meeting.
2. Principals' meeting.
3. Mr. Robert Gunther.
4. Representatives spoke to principals at meeting.
5. A.P. management-overview.
6. Productions made at school.

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
CONTACTED	27.8	24.3	23.9	25.9
IF YES -				
STAFF VISIT				
SYSTEM	58.8	42.9	66.7	57.6
STATE	13.3	50.0	50.0	28.0
INSERVICE				
SYSTEM	35.3	14.3	44.4	33.3
STATE	33.3	25.0	50.0	36.0
NEWSLETTERS, ETC.				
SYSTEM	70.6	71.4	55.6	66.7
STATE	73.3	75.0	50.0	68.0
TELEPHONE				
SYSTEM	29.4	57.1	55.6	42.4
STATE	13.3	25.0	0.0	12.0
SERVED ON COMMITTEE				
SYSTEM	11.8	14.3	0.0	9.1
STATE	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.0
OTHER				
SYSTEM	5.9	0.0	0.0	3.0
STATE	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.0

#27. TEACHER GUIDE DISTRIBUTION

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL TEACHERS	54.0	27.3	21.6	42.8
GIVEN ON REQUEST	15.0	27.3	29.7	20.2
NOT PROVIDED	3.0	9.1	2.7	3.8
COPIES IN SCHOOL	25.0	36.4	32.4	28.3
DON'T KNOW	2.0	0.0	13.5	4.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
GIVEN TO ALL TEACHERS	41.8	20.5	10.9	28.0
GIVEN ON REQUEST	25.3	12.8	30.4	23.8
NOT PROVIDED	1.3	5.1	6.5	3.7
COPIES IN SCHOOL	29.1	53.8	47.8	40.2
DON'T KNOW	0.0	5.1	4.3	2.4
MORE THAN ONE WAY	2.5	2.6	0.0	1.8

Principals reported that teacher guides are most frequently given to all teachers. However, a significant percentage (20.2) reported that they are given only on teacher request. A significant percentage (28.3) reported that multiple copies are on hand. Today, more principals reported that copies are given to all teachers than in 1981.

#28. ITV BROADCAST SCHEDULE INFORMATION

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MONITOR	21.0	31.8	18.9	22.0
CATALOG/SCHEDULE	78.0	68.2	64.9	73.6
SEE BOARD	4.0	4.5	2.7	3.8
OTHER	8.0	0.0	8.1	6.9
DIFFICULTY	8.0	9.0	18.9	10.7

"Other" methods for finding out about the schedule include:

METHOD	NO. RESPONDING
1. Local newspaper, Dept. of Ed. Bulletin	1
2. Media specialist	3
3. Have not pursued ITV	1
4. TV Guide	1
5. School system ITV Coordinator	1
6. Cable schedule	1
7. Bulletins from LAMS	1
8. Schedules sent to schools	1
9. Rarely use it	1

Principals reported that they find out about the ITV broadcast schedule most frequently through the MITV Catalog Schedule. The next means most frequently mentioned by 22% is the Monitor. The See Board is reported by only 3.8% of principals.

#29. AWARENESS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMING

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SPECIAL PROGRAMMING HOUR	27.0	36.4	24.3	27.7
SEE BOARD	17.0	27.3	21.6	19.5

A greater percentage of principals reported that they are aware of the SEE Board than report using it to get programming information. Apparently, a large number of principals are unaware of these two methods of getting programming information.

#30. HOW OFTEN DOES PRINCIPAL OFFER SUGGESTIONS?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
OFTEN	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
SOMETIMES	63.0	50.0	43.3	56.6
RARELY	25.0	36.4	48.6	32.1
NEVER	4.0	13.6	8.1	6.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
OFTEN	8.8	2.5	7.0	6.7
SOMETIMES	51.2	55.0	53.5	52.8
RARELY	37.5	32.5	34.9	35.6
NEVER	2.5	10.0	4.7	4.9

The results of this question suggest that principals continue to encourage ITV use by teachers in over 56.6% of the cases. It continues to be an area of concern that over one-third of the principals reported that they rarely or never suggest programs to teachers. These findings are consistent with those reported in the 1980-81 study.

#31. WHO INFORMS TEACHERS ABOUT ITV?

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SYSTEM ITV COORDINATOR	23.0	9.1	29.7	22.6
ITV DIVISION, SDE	11.0	4.5	5.4	8.8
TV STATION	5.0	0.0	5.4	4.4
PRINCIPAL	36.0	18.2	10.8	27.6
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	74.0	81.8	67.6	73.6
OTHER TEACHERS	19.0	13.6	16.2	17.6
NO ONE	6.0	13.6	16.2	9.4

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
SYSTEM ITV COORDINATOR	15.2	18.4	17.4	16.6
ITV DIVISION, SDE	17.7	15.8	21.7	18.4
TV STATION	3.8	13.2	19.6	10.4
PRINCIPAL	32.9	21.1	34.8	30.7
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST	69.6	86.8	71.7	74.2
OTHER TEACHERS	24.1	23.7	23.9	23.9
NO ONE	7.6	7.9	4.3	6.7

The library media specialist is reported as the person who usually informs teachers about ITV programs in the majority of cases. Principals also seem to see themselves and the system ITV coordinators as important sources of information in ITV programming. This is concurrent with 1981 findings.

#32. GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
SUBJECT SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	45.2	57.9	67.6	53.2
NEUTRAL	54.7	42.1	32.4	46.8
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TEACHERS				
FAVOR	63.5	65.0	63.9	63.8
NEUTRAL	36.4	35.0	36.1	36.2
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	68.0	75.0	81.8	76.0
NEUTRAL	23.7	25.0	18.2	23.9
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OTHER SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	35.6	50.0	55.6	43.4
NEUTRAL	63.0	50.0	44.4	55.8
AGAINST	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.8
PARENTS				
FAVOR	33.3	35.3	47.1	37.0
NEUTRAL	63.1	64.7	52.9	60.7
AGAINST	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.2
STUDENTS				
FAVOR	68.6	63.2	51.4	62.5
NEUTRAL	31.4	36.8	48.6	37.5
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION				
FAVOR	33.8	30.0	61.3	39.8
NEUTRAL	66.2	70.0	38.7	60.2
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
SUBJECT SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	54.1	60.0	53.8	55.9
NEUTRAL	45.9	37.1	46.2	43.2
AGAINST	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.9
TEACHERS				
FAVOR	74.0	57.9	37.2	60.1
NEUTRAL	26.0	39.5	62.8	39.2
AGAINST	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.6
LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	86.3	78.9	71.4	80.4
NEUTRAL	13.7	21.1	28.6	19.6
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OTHER SPECIALISTS				
FAVOR	43.1	51.4	38.5	44.0
NEUTRAL	56.9	42.9	61.5	54.4
AGAINST	0.0	5.7	0.0	1.6
PARENTS				
FAVOR	37.1	30.3	26.8	32.6
NEUTRAL	62.9	66.7	73.2	66.7
AGAINST	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.7
STUDENTS				
FAVOR	66.2	57.1	45.5	58.0
NEUTRAL	33.8	42.9	54.5	42.0
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION				
FAVOR	39.3	31.3	31.7	35.1
NEUTRAL	60.7	68.8	68.3	64.9
AGAINST	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Principals view the groups as being generally positive in their attitudes toward the use of ITV. Library media specialists are seen as most positive, while the teachers' organizations and parents are seen as primarily neutral. Principals believe that 62.5% of students favor use of ITV, while 37.5% of students are viewed as neutral.

#33. INAPPROPRIATE USE OF ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
USED ITV TOO MUCH	16.8	10.0	2.8	11.9
INAPPROPRIATE USE	17.7	15.0	2.8	13.2

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
USED ITV TOO MUCH	19.5	12.8	0.0	12.4
INAPPROPRIATE USE	22.4	10.3	2.3	13.8

#34. MAXIMUM APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF ITV PER WEEK

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1/4 HOUR	7.0	27.3	13.5	11.3
1/2 HOUR	19.0	4.5	21.6	17.6
1 HOUR	34.0	22.7	8.1	26.4
1-1/2 HOURS	12.0	9.1	13.5	11.9
2 - 4 HOURS	8.0	4.5	2.7	6.3
5 OR MORE HOURS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NO LIMIT	13.0	31.8	35.2	20.8

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
1/4 HOUR	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.6
1/2 HOUR	7.7	10.3	15.2	10.4
1 HOUR	32.1	41.0	28.3	33.1
1-1/2 HOURS	26.9	7.7	6.5	16.6
2 - 4 HOURS	10.3	5.1	6.5	8.0
5 OR MORE HOURS	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
NO LIMIT	21.8	33.3	43.5	30.7

Most principals do feel there should be a limit to the amount of ITV viewed, but the range of what the limit should be was fairly evenly distributed. A majority of principals (55.9%) indicated that the limit should be between thirty minutes and one-and-one-half hours per week.

PRINCIPALS' PREPARATION FOR USE OF ITV

#35. TRAINING IN THE USE OF ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	35.6	15.8	13.9	27.5
IF YES:				
COLLEGE COURSE	33.5	0.0	40.0	33.3
SYSTEM INSERVICE	70.9	66.7	80.0	71.8
TV INSERVICE	22.6	33.3	0.0	20.5
WORKSHOPS-PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS	67.7	0.0	40.0	59.0
WORKSHOPS-STATE ITV	19.4	33.3	0.0	17.9
WORKSHOPS-TV STATION	3.2	0.0	0.0	2.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
HAD ITV TRAINING	31.6	13.2	13.0	22.1
IF YES:				
COLLEGE COURSE	28.0	20.6	33.3	27.8
SYSTEM INSERVICE	40.0	40.0	33.3	38.9
TV INSERVICE	12.0	0.0	33.3	13.9
WORKSHOPS-PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS	44.0	80.0	16.7	44.4
WORKSHOPS-STATE ITV	8.0	20.0	16.7	11.1
WORKSHOPS-TV STATION	8.0	20.0	16.7	11.1

About one in four principals reported that they have had training in ITV. Of those, the most frequent method of getting training was through inservice courses or workshops followed by professional meeting workshops.

#36. RECENT TRAINING

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
TRAINING WITHIN PAST 3 YEARS	10.7	4.5	3.6	8.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
TRAINING WITHIN PAST 3 YEARS	12.5	23.5	4.0	12.2

As with the earlier study, only a small percentage of principals (8.5%) reported having had training within the past three years.

REACTIONS TO USE OF ITV

#37. PERCEPTIONS OF ITV

A. Teachers in my school are using more ITV than they have in the past 3 years.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	12.9	31.8	22.2	13.9
	NEITHER	37.6	18.2	38.9	35.1
	DISAGREE	40.8	27.3	22.2	27.8
	NA	8.6	22.7	16.7	12.6
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	23.3	50.0	37.8	34.0
	NEITHER	39.7	28.9	26.7	33.3
	DISAGREE	30.1	15.8	31.1	26.9
	NA	6.8	5.3	4.4	5.8

B. ITV causes many scheduling and administrative problems.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	11.9	18.2	0.0	10.0
	NEITHER	18.5	18.2	19.4	18.7
	DISAGREE	59.1	45.5	63.9	58.7
	NA	9.8	31.8	16.7	14.7
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	6.7	5.3	6.7	6.3
	NEITHER	33.3	21.1	22.2	27.2
	DISAGREE	57.3	65.8	66.7	62.0
	NA	2.7	15.8	4.4	4.4

C. ITV is a useful teaching tool.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	90.7	81.8	83.3	87.7
	NEITHER	6.2	4.5	2.8	5.2
	DISAGREE	1.0	0.0	2.8	1.3
	NA	1.0	13.6	11.1	5.2
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	93.5	94.7	90.9	93.1
	NEITHER	5.2	5.3	9.1	6.3
	DISAGREE	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

D. Teachers don't make enough use of ITV.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	43.0	33.3	50.0	43.3
	NEITHER	37.6	42.9	36.1	38.0
	DISAGREE	15.1	9.1	5.6	12.0
	NA	4.3	13.6	8.3	6.7
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	42.5	54.3	54.5	48.7
	NEITHER	47.9	25.7	45.5	42.1
	DISAGREE	8.2	17.1	0.0	7.9
	NA	1.4	2.9	0.0	1.3

E. If teachers in my school used ITV too much, there would be comments.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	61.5	57.2	57.2	59.9
	NEITHER	25.3	9.7	17.2	21.8
	DISAGREE	6.5	9.5	14.3	8.8
	NA	6.5	19.0	11.4	9.5
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	31.0	48.8	35.0	37.0
	NEITHER	35.2	23.3	37.5	32.5
	DISAGREE	19.7	14.0	20.0	18.2
	NA	14.1	14.0	7.5	12.3

F. Some parents express concern about the amount of ITV watched in the classroom.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	2.1	4.5	2.9	2.6
	NEITHER	12.5	22.7	20.6	15.8
	DISAGREE	71.9	40.9	58.8	64.5
	NA	13.5	31.8	17.6	17.1
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	6.8	13.2	4.5	7.7
	NEITHER	17.6	10.5	25.0	17.9
	DISAGREE	68.9	57.9	61.4	64.1
	NA	6.8	18.4	9.1	10.3

G. Our emphasis on basic education goals makes ITV a frill.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	7.3	4.5	3.0	6.0
	NEITHER	16.7	27.3	21.2	19.2
	DISAGREE	71.9	50.0	66.7	67.5
	NA	4.2	18.2	9.1	7.3
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	2.7	0.0	9.1	3.8
	NEITHER	20.0	5.3	25.0	17.8
	DISAGREE	74.7	84.2	63.6	73.9
	NA	2.7	10.5	2.3	4.5

H. I have inquired about ITV opinions of parents in a needs-assessment survey.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	NEITHER	6.4	9.1	11.8	8.0
	DISAGREE	43.6	40.9	52.9	44.7
	NA	50.0	50.0	35.3	42.7
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.7
	NEITHER	9.9	10.8	11.6	10.6
	DISAGREE	36.6	54.1	53.5	48.7
	NA	52.1	35.1	34.9	43.0

I. One of the first things to go in a tight budgetary environment is ITV.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	18.8	28.6	17.6	13.3
	NEITHER	26.0	14.3	35.3	26.5
	DISAGREE	39.6	27.3	29.4	35.8
	NA	15.6	27.3	17.6	17.9
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	19.2	11.1	36.4	22.2
	NEITHER	37.0	41.7	36.4	37.9
	DISAGREE	37.0	38.9	18.2	32.0
	NA	6.8	8.3	9.1	7.8

J. It has become easier over the past 3 years to justify funds for supporting ITV.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	AGREE	14.6	9.5	26.5	16.6
	NEITHER	45.8	47.6	44.2	39.8
	DISAGREE	22.9	9.5	11.8	18.5
	NA	16.7	33.3	17.6	19.2
1980-81 STUDY	AGREE	9.5	19.4	6.8	11.0
	NEITHER	48.6	44.4	61.4	51.3
	DISAGREE	32.4	16.7	20.5	25.3
	NA	9.5	19.4	11.4	12.3

#38. USES OF ITV

A. To extend the range of experiences available to students.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	89.5	81.8	89.2	88.3
	NEITHER	7.4	9.1	10.8	8.4
	UNIMPORTANT	2.4	4.5	0.0	1.9
	NA	1.1	4.5	0.0	1.3
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	98.7	97.3	93.2	96.8
	NEITHER	1.3	2.7	6.8	3.2
	UNIMPORTANT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

B. To present new material.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	70.2	61.9	77.8	70.9
	NEITHER	11.7	23.8	22.2	15.9
	UNIMPORTANT	16.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
	NA	2.1	14.3	0.0	3.3
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	72.4	73.0	74.4	73.1
	NEITHER	23.7	27.0	14.0	21.8
	UNIMPORTANT	1.3	0.0	11.6	3.8
	NA	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3

C. To provide different approaches for presenting material.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	81.3	90.9	91.7	85.1
	NEITHER	15.6	4.5	8.3	12.3
	UNIMPORTANT	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.9
	NA	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.1
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	92.0	91.9	88.6	91.0
	NEITHER	6.7	8.1	11.4	8.3
	UNIMPORTANT	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

D. To reinforce materials taught in other lessons.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	80.0	81.8	88.9	82.4
	NEITHER	14.7	9.1	11.1	13.1
	UNIMPORTANT	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.6
	NA	1.0	9.1	0.0	1.9
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	86.8	88.9	81.4	85.8
	NEITHER	10.5	11.1	16.3	12.3
	UNIMPORTANT	2.6	0.0	2.3	1.9
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

E. To bring new resources and/or persons into the classrooms.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	91.7	81.8	91.7	90.2
	NEITHER	5.2	13.6	8.3	7.1
	UNIMPORTANT	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.9
	NA	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.1
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	94.7	91.9	90.7	92.5
	NEITHER	4.0	5.4	9.3	5.8
	UNIMPORTANT	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
	NA	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.6

F. To motivate students' interest in a subject.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	89.6	90.5	75.0	86.3
	NEITHER	7.3	9.5	19.4	10.5
	UNIMPORTANT	2.1	4.8	5.6	3.3
	NA	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	89.2	94.6	78.6	87.6
	NEITHER	8.1	5.4	14.3	9.2
	UNIMPORTANT	2.7	0.0	4.8	2.6
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.7

G. To lighten the teaching load.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	18.9	13.6	13.9	17.0
	NEITHER	24.2	45.5	27.8	28.1
	UNIMPORTANT	45.3	22.7	44.4	41.8
	NA	11.6	18.2	13.9	13.1
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	5.5	2.7	4.8	4.6
	NEITHER	27.4	29.7	42.9	32.2
	UNIMPORTANT	54.8	51.4	47.6	52.0
	NA	12.3	16.2	4.8	11.2

H. To allow teacher to observe students.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	29.0	18.2	36.1	29.1
	NEITHER	28.0	54.5	36.1	33.8
	UNIMPORTANT	33.3	13.6	22.2	27.8
	NA	9.7	13.6	5.6	9.3
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	15.3	18.9	26.2	19.2
	NEITHER	33.3	35.1	42.9	36.4
	UNIMPORTANT	41.7	35.1	26.2	35.8
	NA	9.7	10.8	4.8	7.6

I. To allow student and/or teacher a brief time to relax.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	4.2	0.0	8.3	4.6
	NEITHER	12.6	14.3	11.1	12.5
	UNIMPORTANT	70.5	57.1	47.2	63.2
	NA	12.6	28.6	33.3	19.7
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	2.7	8.3	7.0	5.2
	NEITHER	13.3	16.7	14.0	14.3
	UNIMPORTANT	69.3	55.6	62.8	64.3
	NA	14.7	19.4	16.3	16.3

J. To permit individualization of instruction.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	35.2	42.1	60.0	42.1
	NEITHER	35.2	31.6	22.9	31.7
	UNIMPORTANT	23.1	5.2	8.6	17.2
	NA	6.5	21.1	8.6	9.0
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	47.2	57.1	57.1	52.3
	NEITHER	26.4	34.3	28.6	28.9
	UNIMPORTANT	16.7	2.9	9.5	11.4
	NA	9.7	5.7	4.8	7.4

K. To present subject matter where there is not a special teacher.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY	IMPORTANT	59.1	40.0	47.2	53.7
	NEITHER	12.9	15.0	19.4	14.8
	UNIMPORTANT	16.1	15.0	11.1	14.8
	NA	11.8	30.0	22.2	16.8
1980-81 STUDY	IMPORTANT	58.7	30.6	62.8	53.2
	NEITHER	8.0	22.2	11.6	12.3
	UNIMPORTANT	9.3	17.9	7.0	9.7
	NA	24.0	33.3	18.6	24.7

1983-84 STUDY

L. To serve as a suitable teaching alternative in emergency situations to cover essential learning skills.

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
IMPORTANT	21.5	14.3	30.6	22.7
NEITHER	11.8	38.1	25.0	18.7
UNIMPORTANT	48.4	23.8	30.6	40.7
NA	18.3	23.8	13.9	19.3

1980-81 STUDY: To serve as a suitable teaching alternative in emergency situations.

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
IMPORTANT	19.4	11.1	38.1	22.7
NEITHER	19.4	30.6	21.4	22.7
UNIMPORTANT	41.7	36.1	19.0	34.0
NA	19.4	21.4	20.7	17.3

1980-81 STUDY: To cover essential learning skills

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
IMPORTANT	49.3	63.9	55.8	54.5
NEITHER	26.7	27.9	32.6	28.6
UNIMPORTANT	14.7	2.8	11.6	11.0
NA	9.3	5.6	0.0	5.8

#39. DIFFICULTY IN MAINTAINING ITV BUDGET

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
MUCH HARDER	18.4	11.8	9.7	15.6
HARDER	23.0	17.6	29.0	23.7
NO DIFFERENCE	54.0	70.6	54.8	56.3
EASIER	2.3	0.0	6.5	3.0
MUCH EASIER	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.5

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR.HIGH	TOTAL
MUCH HARDER	23.9	8.8	17.1	18.3
HARDER	22.4	32.4	41.5	30.3
NO DIFFERENCE	46.3	58.8	39.0	47.2
EASIER	7.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
MUCH EASIER	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.7

The number of principals who felt the ITV budget is harder to maintain than that for other materials has decreased somewhat since 1981.

#40. TIME SPENT ON ITV

1983-84 STUDY

	ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
A FAIR AMOUNT	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.1
A MODERATE AMOUNT	2.1	4.5	2.7	2.6
A LITTLE	45.3	13.6	16.2	34.2
NONE	52.6	77.3	78.4	62.6

1980-81 STUDY

	ELEM.	JR./MIDDLE	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
A FAIR AMOUNT	1.3	2.6	2.2	1.8
A MODERATE AMOUNT	3.8	7.7	0.0	3.7
A LITTLE	29.1	25.6	28.3	28.0
NONE	65.8	64.1	69.6	66.5

Most principals (96.8%) spent little or no time on ITV issues. Similar findings were reported in 1981.

#41. VARIOUS ASPECTS OF ITV

A. ITV shows great possibilities for stimulating teacher creativity.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	45.3	60.0	70.3	30.9
	NEITHER	44.2	30.0	24.3	35.5
	DISAGREE	10.5	10.0	5.4	34.2
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	49.4	65.8	44.4	51.9
	NEITHER	41.6	28.9	44.4	39.4
	DISAGREE	9.1	5.3	8.9	8.1
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.6

B. Teachers, when using instructional television, lose some of their importance in the classroom setting.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	4.2	14.2	2.7	5.2
	NEITHER	16.8	14.2	24.3	18.3
	DISAGREE	80.0	71.5	73.0	77.1
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	2.6	0.0	4.5	2.5
	NEITHER	21.1	15.8	25.0	20.9
	DISAGREE	75.0	78.9	68.2	74.1
	NA	1.3	5.3	2.3	2.5

C. The personal relationship between student and teacher is lost when instructional television is used.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	6.3	14.3	2.7	6.5
	NEITHER	22.1	23.8	27.0	23.5
	DISAGREE	71.6	61.9	70.3	70.0
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	2.6	0.0	13.3	5.0
	NEITHER	20.8	21.1	24.4	21.9
	DISAGREE	76.6	78.9	60.0	72.5
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.6

D. The development of more new instructional television programs is a waste of time.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	2.1	4.8	0.0	1.9
	NEITHER	14.6	14.3	16.2	14.9
	DISAGREE	83.3	81.0	83.8	83.1
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	1.3	0.0	4.5	1.9
	NEITHER	11.8	8.1	20.5	13.4
	DISAGREE	86.8	91.9	72.7	84.1
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.6

E. Wide use of instructional television is needed.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	24.0	19.0	37.8	26.6
	NEITHER	49.0	66.7	43.2	50.0
	DISAGREE	27.0	14.8	18.9	23.4
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	41.0	41.7	57.8	45.9
	NEITHER	52.6	44.4	35.6	45.9
	DISAGREE	6.4	13.9	4.4	7.5
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.6

F. The use of instructional television makes any subject matter more interesting.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	34.4	42.8	56.8	40.9
	NEITHER	44.8	47.6	37.8	43.5
	DISAGREE	20.8	9.5	5.4	15.6
	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	38.2	47.4	28.9	37.7
	NEITHER	48.7	36.8	57.8	48.4
	DISAGREE	13.2	15.8	11.1	13.2
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.6

G. Instructional television should inspire students to greater curiosity and learning.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	74.7	80.9	73.0	75.2
	NEITHER	21.0	14.2	27.0	21.6
	DISAGREE	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.6
	NA	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.1
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	73.7	70.3	57.8	68.4
	NEITHER	26.3	79.7	35.6	29.7
	DISAGREE	0.0	0.0	4.4	1.3
	NA	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.6

H. Instructional television is all right, but I feel it has been overemphasized.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	10.2	4.7	2.7	7.8
	NEITHER	41.8	57.1	59.5	48.1
	DISAGREE	48.0	33.3	35.1	42.9
	NA	0.0	4.7	2.7	1.3
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	5.3	2.7	6.7	5.1
	NEITHER	50.0	40.5	46.7	46.8
	DISAGREE	43.4	56.8	44.4	46.8
	NA	1.3	0.0	2.2	1.3

I. Children watch enough television at home; they don't need to watch more in school.

		ELEM.	MIDDLE	HIGH	TOTAL
1983-84 STUDY:	AGREE	5.1	23.8	0.0	6.4
	NEITHER	28.6	33.3	32.4	30.1
	DISAGREE	66.3	42.9	62.2	62.2
	NA	0.0	0.0	5.4	1.3
1980-81 STUDY:	AGREE	1.3	2.8	6.7	3.2
	NEITHER	28.0	19.4	31.1	26.9
	DISAGREE	69.3	77.8	60.0	68.6
	NA	1.3	0.0	2.2	1.3

#42. PROGRAM NEEDS DURING NEXT THREE YEARS

Principals indicated the following needs:

1. Encourage wider, more consistent use of ITV to support instruction and to upgrade our in-school broadcast system to all. More use of equipment by students and staff.
2. Curriculum match for LEA
3. To more effectively teach teachers and pupils how to develop and apply intellectual skills.
4. Send questionnaire to ask input about: time to air the programs; subject matter.

5. Foreign language for elementary students
   Math (functional)
   Computers

6. Scheduling of programs which are within our daily schedule - (programs scheduled between 11:45 A.M. and 1:00 P.M. are conflicting with our lunch/recess schedule). Our day ends at 2:45 for children.

7. Inservice - Language Arts (Integrated Language Arts)

8. Support of basic instruction in reading, writing, math, science and social studies.

9. Literature - developing an interest in good reading materials. Science and Geography studies.

10. Teacher training series that could be viewed at school. 1/2 hr. or 1 hr. segments on: normal development 0-7 yrs.; specific suggestions and examples of behavior management with young children.

11. Same.

12. We are a very small program with a limited budget. We have had no use of the ITV programming.

13. Additional equipment.

14. I am interested in seeing programs on a 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th grade level on areas that would be of benefit to a 7th grade study of "World Geography". Classroom text is Harper, Robert A. Stoltman, Joseph P.; World Geography, Steck-Vaughn Company, Austin, Texas, 1983.

15. Expand senior high level programming.

16. As a special educator of young children who are severely multi-handicapped, finding a variety of ways to teach simple basic skills is necessary. In the past I have used ITV on a regular basis however this year it has caused scheduling problems.

    Ideas for programming: more programs on Pre-K; K level. High interest level programming using low vocabulary for older spec. ed. students.

17. ITV utilization will increase dependent upon funding. However, department chairmen may well decide to channel funds in other directions.

18. Unfortunately our school system doesn't encourage its use so the ITV survey here is answered on basis of nonuse.

19. Computer skills
    Computer inservice
    Tutorial programming
    Upper elementary "values education"

20. We are the only school in Garrett County which does not receive direct programming. All of our use is through recorded ITV tapes. I have explored every avenue to receive this service direct, but with no success.

21. More math.

22. More appropriate programming in science and social studies is needed. Video taping programs to use when most appropriate for the teacher and her class would make it far more valuable; however this is a problem best handled locally. Systems providing needed equipment. Media specialist following through at the school level.

23. Science programs.

24. Microcomputer programming.
    Career education.
    Science programming.
    Functional skills relative to areas of Maryland Functional Skills program.

25. Science area.

26. Majority of Programming not appropriate to unique needs of student population.

27. The greatest opportunities for future use will be video taping. Time frames for units of study during the year and scheduling all other aspects of the curriculum present many problems for use of ITV. Videotaping affords greater flexibility.

28. Replacements/repair of machines in use.
    Utilization of services while expected to "active teach" the academic subjects (45-60 minutes of instruction time devoted to each) - Where do teachers "fit" it in during this time allotment?

29. Since I do not have a full time ITV coordinator, it becomes difficult to keep ITV as a high priority.

30. We develop our own program W.E.M.S. News. All teachers do not have a TV.

31. I believe the classroom teacher needs to respond to this question because they are the people who will use it.

32. Working with family problems (a guidance show)
    What to do with spare time (a show about hobbies-upper elementary and junior high)

33. Day vocational-technical programs.

34. Programs suitable and applicable to vocational-technical education, including related subject matter, i.e. math.

35. Additional equipment to utilize more ITV programs and funds to buy tapes to record programs not broadcast at convenient times for teachers.

36. All senior high subject areas need much greater attention from persons responsible for ITV instructional programming.

37. Computer literacy.
ESOL (ESOC?)
English for parents of LEPS defects.

38. Science
Cultural arts.

39. Writing and listening skills.

40. Specific recommendations from local subject coordinators regarding program choices would be helpful.

41. No comment, however, I would like to see a greater emphasis placed on math instruction.

42. More information about ITV programming.

43. Computer literacy.

44. I see ITV as being of value for retarded students in introducing or reinforcing teacher taught lessons. Programs need to be short: 15 min. maximum; single concept; visual/auditory with suggestions for teacher follow-up in the kinesthetic/hands-on areas; interest high for adolescents with short attention span who cannot read. Suggestions: pre-vocational and career education for the handicapped; social skill development for the retarded.

45. Values education.
Sex education.
Application of higher level thinking skills in problem solving.

46. More services from the TSA
More monitors

47. I don't question the validity or importance of ITV. However, we have not used it, and have no plans for such use at this time.

48. Since this is a vocational school, specialized subjects would be of interest, i.e. some aspect of home repair, child care, cosmotology, health, etc. We teach no academics in this building.

49. Microcomputer education.

50. Literature
Science
News events for students of the elementary level.

51. Teaching children how to watch TV

52. Our county plans programs, materials et al for the instructional programs. I, as principal, have little input.

COMMENTS ON ITV

Principals made the following comments:

1. With a 6 hr. day, an increase in time mandated for reading and math and all the other mandated programs to be met, it is next to impossible to find time to meet even the basic program.

2. We used the video tapes from ASCD for teacher in-service and it was very helpful. Also you can provide simulation activities for children through ITV.

3. This is a special education secondary school with the mission of preparing multiply handicapped adolescents for the world of work. There are occasional programs and series that fit our needs, but most are either too juvenile or too intellectually demanding (abstract concepts) for our population. I am sure, however, that if we had the time and/or inclination to preview more of the offerings, we would find more to incorporate into our programs.

4. We have just acquired a video recorder. We should be able to make good use of it. Our greatest difficulty is with scheduling - our school starts at 8:00 A.M. and dismisses at 2:00 P.M.

5. Inservice should be done with teachers regarding appropriate instructional use of TV programs.

6. ITV is great, but we do not have ability to use unless we video tape. Classes do not meet at time programs are run - does not match. We, therefore, have very limited use of ITV.

7. We have used "Assignment the World", with 3rd-6th grade students to supplement the current events program. Students give the program high marks.

8. We can only get one channel on our television (22) and we do not have a VCR so our watching ITV is naturally limited.

COMPLETION TIME

The average time to complete the principals' questionnaire was 20.2 minutes.

CONCLUSION

This study found principals' responses to be very consistent with the results reported in 1981. Some changes noted include: a slightly higher estimate of usage by classroom teachers, an increase in the use of local or regional videotape libraries, and increases in availability and access to ITV programming. Principals continue to be generally positive toward the use of ITV by teachers.

ITV COORDINATORS

INTRODUCTION

The 1983-1984 survey collected information from each of the twenty-four systems. It was decided to collect information directly from the system ITV coordinators rather than from the superintendents. During the 1981 study, questionnaires were sent to the superintendents of each system who were to complete the questionnaires. Some superintendents (56.5%) completed the questionnaires, but the others passed them along to their designates. Since the responsibilities of persons completing the forms varied, comparable data could not be collected. Instead, it was decided to obtain data from those individuals in the systems who would be most directly involved with system-wide use of ITV. Therefore, the data collected from the ITV coordinators is not comparable to the 1981 study but does represent what we feel is an accurate reflection of current practice. Questionnaires were sent to the ITV coordinators in all 24 Maryland school systems and 23 were returned. In each case, the response was made by the ITV coordinator.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Almost all of the ITV coordinators responding to the survey (22 of 23 or 95.6%) reported that they had specific training in ITV. One did not respond to this item. Most coordinators received training through Department of Education inservice or via school system inservice. Types of training included:

College Coursework	43.0%
School System Inservice	60.8%
Televised ITV Inservice Series	39.1%
Workshops at Professional Meetings	52.1%
State Department of Education Inservice	78.2%
Workshop by Local TV Station	0 %
Other	8.6%

"Other" responses:

1. I have taught ITV utilization for U. of Md. and local systems
2. Satellite communications
3. Memo

A majority of the ITV coordinators (60.8%) had received training recently (within the past three years) while 34.7% reported having received no training during this period.

BUDGETARY SUPPORT

Coordinators reported that financial support for ITV during the last three years was mixed, increasing in seven systems, decreasing in seven systems, and remaining unchanged in eight systems. ITV coordinators' expectations for the next three years indicated that same trend. Ten (43%) were uncertain, while 6 (26%) expected increases, one (4.3%) expected a decrease and five (21.7%) expected support to remain unchanged.

Regarding the budgetary environment of ITV, no coordinator felt it would be easier to get state or federal funds for ITV, seven (30.4%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and sixteen (69.5%) disagreed. Three (13%) felt ITV is a way to save on instructional costs, four (17.3%) neither agreed nor disagreed, while sixteen (69.5%) disagreed. Sixteen (69.5%) disagreed that ITV tends to use more than its share of the budget, six (26%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and only one (4.3%) agreed that ITV tended to use more. Seven (30.4%) agreed that ITV would be one of the first items to go in a tight budget, five (21.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and eleven (57.8%) did not feel that ITV would be the first to go. Twelve (52.1%) agreed that it had become easier to justify funds, five (21.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and six (26%) disagreed with the statement.

In maintaining a budget for ITV use compared with other instructional materials, eleven coordinators (44.7%) felt that it is harder or much harder to maintain a budget for ITV. A majority of coordinators (52.1%) felt there is no difference or that it is much easier.

Coordinators reported that funds for ITV tend to come from these sources: system 51.5%, schools 21%, state programs 14.9%, federal government 8.2%. Other sources account for 3.9% of the funds. Specifically, these "other" sources were listed as:

1. PTA and other publics
2. PTA
3. Project Basic

The operating budget for instructional television in each system averaged $57,956. This average represents a very large range of funds, from no budget in some systems, to a high of $375,000 in one. Four systems reported budgets above $100,000, one reported no budget (or did not know the budget), while five systems reported budgets above $10,000. Seven systems with reported budgets received less than $10,000.

Regarding a systematic process for replacing old ITV equipment, eight systems (34.7%) reported that they do have a systematic process for replacing old hardware, while fifteen (65.3%) stated that they do not.

AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION

All twenty-three coordinators indicated that ITV programming is available in their systems. Twenty-one systems reported reception from on-air broadcast from public television, nine from cable television, nineteen from cassette/videotape, and eight from a closed circuit or master antenna system. None reported use of a videodisc.

The number of teachers in the systems varied widely from a low of 230 to a high of 6,900. Estimates of the percentage of teachers regularly using ITV ranged from 5% to 85% with a mean of 42.4%. This revealed that there is no significant correlation between system size and number of teachers using ITV.

Most coordinators (82.5%) reported that microcomputer usage rarely or never conflicts with ITV usage. Only 17.2% reported conflicts on a daily, weekly, or monthly frequency.

Eleven (47.8%) of the ITV coordinators reported that their systems produce some of their own ITV programs. Programs are produced most frequently for instructional use (39.1%), inservice training (39.1%), production experience for teachers (39.1%), and student feedback (39.1%). Next, in order of frequency, are administrative use (30.4%) and teacher feedback (21.7%).

All except one system always or usually include ITV use in the design of new buildings. One system felt the question did not apply. Fourteen systems increased the number of TV sets, ten (43.4%) plan increases for the next three years, while four (17.4%) do not plan to increase the number. Seventeen systems (73.9%) added video equipment during the past three years and twelve systems (52.1%) plan to add video hardware during the next three years. The same proportion of systems (73.9%) expanded their videotape libraries in the last three years, while twelve (52.1%) plan expansion in the next three years. Nine systems (39.1%) added a master antenna or cable distribution system, while seven systems (30.4%) plan to do so in the next three years. Two systems (8.7%) have no plans for cable or master antenna systems. Production equipment had been added by eleven systems (47.8%), seven systems (30.4%) plan to add during the next three years, while only two (8.7%) have no plans. No systems reported adding videodisc equipment, but two (8.7%) plan to add videodisc in the next three years. Sixteen systems have no plans for videodisc equipment.

Systems reported that MITV videotapes are circulated to an average of 52.5% of the schools. However, this is strongly influenced by the fact that eight systems reported circulating to 90% or better of the schools, while four systems reported that no MITV tapes are circulated. Systems reported duplicating and sending MITV videotapes to an average of 43.4% of the schools. But results again represent a wide range of percentages. Five systems duplicate and send tapes to 90% or better of the schools, while six systems reported that they do not send duplicates to any schools.

All ITV coordinators responding to the survey (23 or 100%) reported that their systems participate in ITV series development, selection, or evaluation. In addition, all of the coordinators reported that they had contact with the ITV division during the 1983-84 school year. The types of contact included:

Staff visits	23 or 100%
Inservice workshops	19 or 82.6%
Newsletters, guides, or other publicity	23 or 100%
Telephone conversation	23 or 100%
Served on curriculum committees	2 or 8.6%
Appearance in local productions	0
Other communications	6 or 26%

"Other" communications included:

1. MSDE reproduced videotapes for county.
2. Visited classroom utilizing ITV.
3. Visitations to discuss workshops.
4. I visit them when I have a problem.
5. Summer inservice 1983 & 1984.

SUPPORT FOR ITV

Generally speaking, most ITV coordinators (16 or 69.5%) strongly encourage the use of ITV. The others (7 or 30.4%) encourage use but leave it to the discretion of individual teachers. All twenty-three coordinators reported that they have system-wide responsibility for ITV. The titles of these individuals are: thirteen ITV coordinators, four library media coordinators, no coordinator of learning resources, two curriculum coordinators, and six "others":

1. Coordinator-media technology
2. Supervisor
3. Specialist in instruction-elementary
4. Media Resource teacher does all media
5. Library media assistant
6. Elementary Supervisor

Coordinators reported spending an average of 20.5% of their time on ITV. Three reported spending no time on ITV, while four reported spending 50% or more of their time on ITV. Staff size reported ranges from no staff to eighteen. The average staff size is 4.2. Seven systems reported having no staff.

Twenty-one systems (91.3%) reported that their systems make inservice workshops on ITV available to teachers. The person conducting the workshops most frequently comes from the ITV division of the state department. This was reported in nineteen systems. Six systems (26%) reported personnel from the school, four (17.4%) from "other" sources, and one (4.3%) from a university or college. "Other" sources included:

1. Central TV staff
2. Baltimore City Schools, Office of Media & Technology (ITV Coordinator)
3. ITV Coordinator
4. Supervisor

Regarding uses of ITV, coordinators felt ITV was very important to extend the range of experiences available to students, to motivate students' interest in a subject, and to bring in new resources or persons into the classroom. They felt ITV is moderately important to present new materials, to reinforce material taught in other lessons, and to cover essential learning skills. Coordinators felt it was very unimportant to provide teachers with time to relax or to serve as a suitable learning opportunity in emergency situations. Most did not feel that ITV is important to lighten the teaching load.

In assessing the general attitude of various groups of people, sixteen (69.6%) ITV coordinators felt that the school board favors ITV use, while seven (30.4%) felt the board is neutral. None felt the board is against ITV use. Thirteen (56.5%) felt parents favor ITV, while ten (43.4%) thought parents are neutral toward ITV. Principals were reported as being favorable by nineteen (82.6%), while only three (13%) felt principals are neutral. Nineteen (82.6%) believed department chairpersons or subject matter specialists favor ITV use, while three (13.1%) believed that this group is neutral. Sixteen (69.6%) felt teachers favor its use, while six (26.1%) felt they are neutral. Fourteen (60.9%) thought specialists in the schools favor ITV use while nine (39.2%) felt they are neutral. Twenty-two (95.6%) believed library media specialists favor ITV, while only one (4.3%) felt library media specialists are neutral. Twenty (86.9%) felt students are favorable toward ITV usage, while three (13.0%) believed they are neutral. Seventeen (73.9%) coordinators felt that the school system staff favors its use, while six (26.1%) felt they are neutral. Twelve (52.2%) felt that teacher organizations favor its use while eleven (47.0%) felt they are neutral. ITV coordinators reported generally positive attitudes toward the use of ITV by all groups listed. No groups were felt to be against the use of ITV by any ITV coordinators.

OVERALL REACTIONS TOWARD ITV

Responding to some statements about various aspects of ITV, six coordinators (26.1%) strongly agreed while thirteen (56.2%) agreed that ITV shows great possibilities for stimulating teacher creativity. Fifteen (65.2%) strongly disagreed while seven (30.4%) disagreed that teachers lose some of their importance when using ITV. Sixteen (69.6%) strongly disagreed and six (26%) disagreed that the personal relationship between student and teacher is lost when ITV is used. Seventeen (73.9%) strongly disagreed and five (21.7%) disagreed that the development of more new ITV programs is a waste of time. Nine (39.1%) strongly agreed and eleven (47.8%) agreed that wider use of ITV is needed. Thirteen (56.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that the use of ITV makes any subject matter more interesting. Seven (30.4%) were neutral toward that statement. Twenty-one (91.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that ITV should inspire students to greater curiosity and learning. Twenty-one (91.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that ITV had been overemphasized. Twenty-one (91.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that children do not need to see television at school. Sixteen (69.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that "my school system is using ITV more this year than it has in the past three years."

Coordinators we're asked to indicate what they see as their greatest program needs during the next three years and why. Following are their responses:

1. Present programs are excellent. The quality is continually improving. However, because of the inability of school systems to correlate with specific ITV programs it is essential funding be made available at the state and local levels to purchase video equipment and video tapes.

2. Professional Development Programs: for teachers; for administrators and supervisors. Expanded science/mathematics series. Student writing series. Humanities offerings.

3. There is a need for programs at the high school level in the higher level math and sciences and foreign languages.

4. More Maryland history materials. Visual literacy or how to be a more discriminating user of TV in general. Students need to know how to select what they view and how to use the information.

5. Program needs are going to be greatest in the area of in-service and staff development. Staff cuts and changing school demands (i.e. computers, state mandates, teacher training out of field) will require updating and retraining of staff with a wide variety of resources, one of which is ITV.

6. Continue the development of series, such as, state government, for areas in which no support materials exist for the classroom teacher. Develop updated programs for use in LEA inservice.

7. I have been impressed with the variety and quality of programs produced annually during my three years as Coordinator of the program. My only observation would be to continue to produce quality programs in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics.

8. Spend funds at local level.

9. Teacher inservice programs in areas of Math, Health, and Creative Writing.

10. More funding for equipment, especially T.V.s. More complete use of high tech to enable Jr.-Sr. high schools to use 6-7 periods per day (schedule conflicts).

11. We feel a need for more Language Arts/Reading programming, both for lower achievers and gifted or enriched students. Art and Music, packages on humanities approach, could use additional consideration, too. Have you ever looked into Foreign Languages, emphasizing the cultural aspects to supplement skills teaching.

12. More programming needs to be developed for use by secondary level participants. At this point there are not too many opportunities for secondary people/teachers/students to become supporters of ITV.

13. Increased materials in the social studies, particularly materials on the history and geography of Maryland and its subdivisions. We need these on a 4th grade level.

14. Programs for the hearing-impaired should be made available using signing rather than special attachments which may or may not be available to the classroom.

15. High school programming
Academic programming (theory, visits with highly respected people of various fields, ex. Physics, Law, Business, Politics, etc.) Foreign Language Programming - Maybe history or traveling done entirely in the language needed (French, Spanish, German).

COMMENTS ON ITV

General comments and suggestions concerning ITV by system coordinators included the following:

1. Our ITV equipment has come from two sources. Federal funds - Chapter 2 in particular and Md. State School Construction Funds when new or renovated buildings have been equipped. ITV is now competing with computers for Chapter 2 funds and the computers have won last year, this year and next year. We really need more VCR units because these give us the greatest flexibility in the use of ITV.

2. Our school system is using two way cable teaching among four high schools this school year. Commencing Sept. 1984 nine or ten high schools will be transmitting classes to each other via cable. We also plan to rebroadcast ITV programming on a limited basis.

3. Relative to questions and/or additional information, presumably it would be helpful for those persons interested in the results of the survey to have some understanding of the factors affecting an LEA's percentage of use of ITV as an instructional tool. Therefore, questions that will provide information about scheduling, availability of television sets and VCR's, administration's commitment to ITV, etc., would be useful. The programming available to Baltimore City through MITV is superior. However, all of the above considerations plus a poor to fair off air picture contribute to a relatively low 30% usage in the Baltimore City Public Schools.

4. Our county is deeply appreciative of the tapes provided, along with the service available from ITV for inservice and workshops.

5. This survey is hardly objective!

6. In our system we use ITV to provide support materials in areas where materials do not exist. In addition, ITV plays a major role in our Curriculum for Media Skills instruction and especially in the areas of media awareness, career exploration and visual literacy. In addition to the questions asked I believe that questions related to present and future use of cable TV by school systems is important. This is a gross oversight in this study if only to document that this new technology is on the horizon for many LEA's and to begin to raise awareness.

7. None - Questionnaire is quite complete.

8. Talbot County Public Schools - The students and their teachers at Easton Middle School produced their own TV news program for the school. Contact Mary Reeser for more information (822-2910).

9. Video PSA's highlighting successful happenings in the school system and shown regularly over local cable systems.
Video presentation of the school system budget to the County Commissioners.
Production of a videotape presentation of the county budget to the general community (prepared by the Board of Education for the County Commissioners).
Production of special TV lessons as requested by classroom teachers to meet specific curriculum weaknesses.

COMPLETION TIME

ITV coordinators reported that they spent an average of 26.9 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the reactions of ITV coordinators can be described as very positive. They view ITV as an important part of the curriculum of the schools throughout Maryland.

REFERENCES

Dirr, J., & Pedone, R. J. *Uses of television for instruction 1976-77: Final report of the School TV Utilization Study*. Washington, DC: Corporation for Public Broadcasting and National Center for Education Statistics, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED180015)

Johnson, K. A., & Keller, P. F. G. *Television in the public schools: Final report of the Maryland ITV Utilization Study*. Unpublished research report, University of Maryland, 1981.

APPENDIX B

Proposed sampling based upon proportio
(rounded to nearest whole number, except
(no value less than one)

COUNTY	No. of Elem. Schools	sample size	No. of Middle/Other	sample size	No. of Secondary Schools	sample size
01 Allegany	17	3	5	1	8	1
02 Anne Arundel	74	12	13	2	25	4
03 Baltimore	97	16	26	4	31	5
04 Calvert	6	1	5	1	4	1
05 Caroline	4	1	1	1	5	1
06 Carroll	16	3	9	1	6	1
07 Cecil	14	2	7	1	6	1
08 Charles	15	2	8	1	5	1
09 Dorchester	5	1	4	1	3	1
10 Frederick	24	3	10	2	9	1
11 Garrett	10	2	5	1	2	1
12 Harford	25	4	8	1	9	1
13 Howard	27	4	13	2	10	2
14 Kent	3	1	4	1	1	1
15 Montgomery	100	16	12	2	43	7
16 Prince George's	117	19	7	1	51	8
17 Queen Anne's	5	1	3	1	1	1
18 St. Mary's	17	3	7	1	4	1
19 Somerset	5	1	6	1	3	1
20 Talbot	5	1	2	1	3	1
21 Washington	28	5	9	1	9	1
22 Wicomico	15	2	2	1	7	1
23 Worcester	5	1	4	1	4	1
30 Baltimore City	121	19	23	4	48	8
TOTALS	755		193		297	
sample (208)		123		34		51

APPENDIX C

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

February 13, 1984

(LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS)

Dear

In 1980, the Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Television, undertook the first comprehensive statewide survey to evaluate the degree and nature of instructional television utilization in Maryland public schools. Your help and endorsement of that study greatly helped to insure its success. Information concerning the use of instructional television continues to be an area of concern both to members of the educational community and to state policy makers.

In response to a request from the Division of Instructional Television, MSDE, we have undertaken to update the 1980 study. We expect this current effort will provide some important longitudinal data that will be used for policy decisions regarding ITV in the coming years.

We have presented the proposed study to the Council for Statewide Planning of Educational Information Systems. The study was approved by the Council on February 8.

We have selected a small sample of schools across the state and are asking the Principal, the Library Media Specialist and five teachers about the ways they use instructional television. We have made every effort to keep the questionnaire short so that it can be completed with very little time and effort. All data collected will be held in the strictest confidence. All respondents will return their completed questionnaires directly to us; only our research staff will see them. Data will be reported in aggregate only so that no individual institution or respondent can be identified. In addition, participation in the study will be completely voluntary. We will also provide an executive summary of the study to all respondents who request it.

If you have any questions regarding details of the study, please do not hesitate to call me at (301) 321-2575. We very much appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)

Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)

Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)

Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)

Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

APPENDIX D

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

April 13, 1984

(ADVANCE LETTER TO PRINCIPALS)

Television has been widely used in Maryland's public schools for many years, yet we have just begun to collect information for its use statewide. This is a concern both to members of the educational community and to state policy makers.

In response to a request from the Division of Instructional Television, MDSE, we have undertaken this study of television use in schools so that they can better serve the people of the state. In addition, the professional organizations listed in this letter have recognized the importance of this study and given their endorsement.

As principal of your school, you play a central role in defining instructional direction. It is essential in planning ITV services for the ITV Division to understand the present use of television in your school. To help in our understanding we are sending you a short questionnaire which we are asking you to take 15 minutes or so to complete. The questionnaire will be arriving at your office within the next 10 days.

In addition, we are asking you to distribute copies of the questionnaire to your school media specialist and to five other teachers. We will send specific instructions on how to select the five teachers. Any assistance and support you might provide us in ensuring a high response rate to the questionnaire would be appreciated.

All data collected will be held in strictest confidence. Results will be reported in aggregate only; no identification of individual schools or respondents will be made. All of the respondents will return their questionnaires directly to us; only immediate project staff will see them.

An executive summary of the study will be available to all

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)
Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)
Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)
Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)
Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

respondents who request it. If you have any questions after you have received the materials, do not hesitate to call us at 301/321-2575.

Your support and cooperation are deeply appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Jones

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)

Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)

Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)

Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)

Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

APPENDIX E

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

April 30, 1984

(COVER LETTER TO PRINCIPALS)

Enclosed are the Maryland ITV Utilization Study materials that I have written to you about. One of the questionnaires is for you to complete. It should take no more than fifteen or twenty minutes of your time. We would very much appreciate your returning it within the next week in the envelope supplied.

Your packet also contains six other questionnaires. One of those is marked "Library Media Specialist." I would appreciate your passing that one to the school Library Media Specialist to complete.

The remaining five questionnaires are to be completed by classroom teachers. We need your help in randomly selecting these five teachers to participate in the study. The following procedure will determine the five classroom teachers to be included in the study.

Choosing Classroom Teachers

Using a current alphabetical list of full-time classroom teachers, select the first five names which alphabetically follow this name:

If five teachers are not obtained before reaching the end of your alphabetical list, continue to the beginning of the list until five are obtained.

(For example, if the name on the label is Thomas, P., and your list of classroom teachers is:

Adams, J.
Boyd, A.
Keller, P.
Michaels, M.
Mitchell, B.
Peters, W.
Reston, V.
Warren, C.
Washington, G.
Zaltman, J.

the questionnaires would be distributed to Warren, Washington, Zaltman, Adams and Boyd.)

After you have chosen the five names using this procedure, please give a cover letter, a Teacher Questionnaire, and a return envelope to each of the five teachers. You may assure the teachers that this is a completely anonymous process; their responses are to be returned directly to us and will only be reported in the aggregate of all Maryland teachers represented in the study.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call us at 321-2576 or 321-2575.

Thank you for helping us with this selection process. We look forward to receiving your response and the responses of your teachers.

Sincerely yours,

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

APPENDIX F

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

April 30, 1984

(COVER LETTER TO LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS)

Dear Library Media Specialist:

Television has been widely used in Maryland public schools for many years, yet we have just begun to collect information for its use statewide. This is a concern both to members of the educational community and to state policy makers.

In response to a request from the Division of Instructional Television, Maryland State Department of Education, we have undertaken this study of television use in schools so that the Division of ITV can better serve the people of the state. In addition, the professional organizations listed in this letter have recognized the importance of this study and have given their endorsement.

Your school has been randomly selected to participate. As library media specialist your insights are particularly important to the study. Since only a few schools have been selected, we must rely on a high level of cooperation from Maryland's educators in order to be able to provide useful information to decision makers. Your cooperation is essential to the success of this project.

Along with this letter you have recieved an ITV Utilization Study Library Media Specialist Questionnaire and a return envelope. Because of the careful design of the questionnaire it should take you only 15-20 minutes to complete. We ask you to complete it within a week of receipt and return it to us in the envelope provided.

All data will be held in the strictest confidence. Data will be reported in aggregate only so that no individual teacher or school can be identified. The code number which appears on each questionnaire is essential to the study; its sole purpose is to enable us to cross-tabulate data by school type and geographic region. An executive summary will be available to all respondents who request it.

If you have any questions after you have received the materials, please do not hesitate to call us at 321-2576 or 321-2575.

We appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Jones

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)
Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)
Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)
Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)
Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

APPENDIX G

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

April 30, 1984

(COVER LETTER TO TEACHERS)

Dear Teacher:

Television has been widely used in Maryland public schools for many years, yet we have just begun to collect information for its use statewide. This is a concern both to members of the educational community and to state policy makers.

In response to a request from the Division of Instructional Television, Maryland State Department of Education, we have undertaken this study of television use in schools so that the Division of ITV can better serve the people of the state. In addition, the professional organizations listed in this letter have recognized the importance of this study and have given their endorsement.

Your school has been randomly selected to participate. In addition, you personally have been randomly selected from among the teachers in your school to participate. Since only a few schools have been selected we must rely on a high level of cooperation from Maryland's teachers in order to be able to provide useful information to decision makers. Your cooperation is essential to the success of this project.

Along with this letter you have received an ITV Utilization Study Teacher Questionnaire and a return envelope. Because of the careful design of the questionnaire it should take you only 15-20 minutes to complete. We ask you to complete it within a week of receipt and return it to us in the envelope provided.

All data will be held in the strictest confidence. Data will be reported in aggregate only so that no individual teacher or school can be identified. The code number which appears on each questionnaire is essential to the study; its sole purpose is to enable us to cross-tabulate data by school type and geographic region. An executive summary will be available to all respondents who request it.

If you have any questions after you have received the materials, please do not hesitate to call us at 321-2576 or 321-2575.

We appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)
Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)
Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)
Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)
Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

APPENDIX H

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

April 30, 1984

(COVER LETTER TO ITV COORDINATORS)

Television has been widely used in Maryland public schools for many years, yet we have just begun to collect information for its use statewide. This is a concern both to members of the educational community and to state policy makers.

In response to a request from the Division of Instructional Television, Maryland State Department of Education, we have undertaken this study of television use in schools so that the Division of ITV can better serve the people of the state. In addition, the professional organizations listed in this letter have recognized the importance of this study and have given their endorsement.

As ITV Coordinator of your county's school system, you play a central role in defining instructional direction. It is essential, in planning ITV services, for the ITV Division to understand your present and projected policies toward the use of television in your schools. To aid in our understanding we are enclosing a short questionnaire which we ask you to take fifteen minutes or so to complete.

In addition, we have randomly selected a small sample of schools across the state and are asking the Principal, the Library Media Specialist, and five Teachers about the ways they do or do not use ITV. Any assistance and support you might provide in ensuring a high response rate to our questionnaire would be appreciated.

All data will be held in the strictest confidence. All of the respondents will return their completed questionnaires directly to us; only immediate project staff will see them. Data will be reported in aggregate only so that no individual educator or school can be identified.

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)
Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)
Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)
Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)
Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

An executive summary of the study will be available to all respondents who request it.

If you have any questions after you have received the materials, please do not hesitate to call us at 321-2576 or 321-2575.

We appreciate your cooperation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:

Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)	Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)	Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)	Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)	Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

APPENDIX I

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
THE MARYLAND ITV UTILIZATION STUDY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

College of Education and Instructional Technology, Department of Instructional Technology (301) 321-2575

June 4, 1984

(FOLLOW-UP LETTER)

Recently, we sent you a packet of questionnaires related to the nature and extent of instructional television in your school. The response to our survey has been excellent, but we would like to get all of the questionnaires back. We know that this is a busy time for everyone. The information we are seeking will be used to plan policy for the ITV Division of the Maryland State Department of Education. Even if you do not use ITV in your school it is very important to us to determine your thoughts on the issues.

As of today, we have not received responses from the following individuals in your school:

_______ 1. you, the principal

_______ 2. the library media specialist

_______ 3. _____ of the five teachers

If you could take a few minutes to check with each of the above we would be very grateful. We have enclosed additional questionnaires and return envelopes just in case they are needed.

Thank you for helping to make this important study a success.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Jones

Paul E. Jones, Ed.D.
Project Director

Endorsed by:
Maryland Educational Media Organization (MEMO)
Maryland Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA)
Maryland Public School Superintendents Association (MPSSA)
Maryland Secondary School Principals Association (MSSPA)
Maryland State Teachers Association (MSTA)

ADDENDUM

Question #2 - Which best describes the setting in which you teach?

1. Departmentalized (13)
2. Special Education (8)
3. Vocational Education (6)
4. Team Teaching (6)
5. Gymnasium - Athletic Fields (6)
6. Media Center (3)
7. Reading Lab (3)
8. Traditional (3)
9. Regrouping according to ability (3)
10. Regular (2)
11. Science classroom (2)
12. Resource (2)
13. Self contained but change classes (2)
14. Exchange for Reading & Math (2)
15. Our school has classrooms of both kinds (2)
16. Departmentalized - Science & S.S. (2)
17. Semi-Open Space
18. Modified Open Space
19. Kindergarten classroom - open space
20. Open space physical plant; self-contained teaching
21. Self-contained classroom with large open doorways
22. Self-contained only for reading
23. Special needs - Teacher - Work with teachers in self-contained setting.
24. Self-contained sp. center SPH
25. Team teaching in a physically self-contained classroom
26. Cluster teaching
27. 4th and 5th team teaching
28. Departmentalized for English - S.S. & Science
29. Departmental Sp Ed
30. Team teach only Reading, Math, S.S. & Science
31. Pull out reading
32. Regrouping for S.S., Math & Science
33. Indoors-Outdoors
34. 6/7th grade Math
35. Cross-grading
36. Physically Limited
37. Special K-3
38. HILS Reading
39. Regrouping for individualized instruction
40. Home visits as well as center based
41. Spec. Ed. - Art/Media
42. Clinic for practical instruction
43. Float from one classroom to another
44. Middle School - change of classes
45. G.A.T.E. Resource
46. I am a physical education teacher. I teach in a variety of spaces.

Question #4 - Which subject(s) do you teach?

1. Media(4)
2. Health (3)
3. Data Processing (2)
4. Drama (2)
5. Spelling (2)
6. Early Childhood
7. Readiness/pre-school - parent teaching/training
8. Kindergarten Curriculum
9. Gifted
10. Tag
11. T.V. Production
12. SAT Prep, Vocabulary & Study Skills
13. English
14. Computer Utilization
15. Agriculture
16. Counselor
17. Speech Therapy
18. Handwriting
19. Driver Education
20. College Psyc
21. Community Resources
22. Business
23. Mechanics
24. Electricity

Question #13 - Where are the microcomputers located?

1. Don't have any (61)
2. Computer lab (44)
3. Classroom (20)
4. Not applicable (15)
5. Special classroom (room) for them (12)
6. Business classes (12)
7. Storage room (11)
8. My classroom (8)
9. Floating for use in all classrooms (8)
10. Don't know (7)
11. Office (5)
12. Special Ed. room (3)
13. Career Center (2)
14. Grade Pod (2)
15. Library (2)
16. Empty classroom (2)
17. Locked closet (2)
18. Conference Room (2)
19. Microcomputer area - Math lab (2)
20. 2nd grade pod
21. L. Arts room
22. We have only one
23. G & T Resource Room
24. Distributive Education
25. Econ
26. Don't have any that use these TV's
27. Science
28. Math-Science storage room
29. Team area - Math lab
30. Advanced Math class
31. Computer Science Dept., Math, Science, Business Ed., Ind. Arts
32. Grade 5 classroom
33. 6th level classroom
34. Reading lab
35. Resource Centers
36. Team - (closet at night)
37. Central location
38. Empty area between classes
39. In one instructor's classroom
40. In classrooms on a scheduled basis

Question #19 - Overall, thinking about what affects your use of ITV, which of the following are difficulties for you?

1. Time in schedule (12)
2. Don't use (10)
3. Not enough time in the day (8)
4. None (6)
5. ITV on air reception (6)
6. Recording (4)
7. Doesn't apply to me (4)
8. Programs available do not include subject matter I am teaching this year. (3)
9. We are not able to have a set
10. We have a VCR machine that is very unreliable. It is available when it is not being repaired.
11. I follow my course curriculum.
12. Fitting programs into team schedules & concern that parents understand that shows are valuable use of class time.
13. If we watch something that we feel is applicable to our teaching, but is not on the county schedule to watch, we are reprimanded sometimes.
14. Getting programming to fit into class curriculum.
15. Not applicable due to my teaching position and my vocational setting.
16. Determining if such programming could mesh with curriculum.
17. Applicability to students.
18. Having programs taped on weekends.
19. Not many F.L. programs.
20. Added time for directed reading and math.
21. Guide for students no longer available. (Mulligan Stew)
22. Difficulty of watching in open classroom situation.
23. No antenna to receive signal.
24. Relevance to curriculum.
25. No means to record to play back later.
26. Having only the title of a program is not enough for one beginning to use ITV.
27. More info about grade levels and program content.
28. Not on time line for study of unit.
29. Support material; worksheets and follow-up.
30. Getting it to the room.
31. My students see programs in individual classrooms.
32. I would rather have children physically active during their P.E. time.
33. The librarian is not concerned with ITV or anything in regard to it.
34. The fact that our school begins at 8:15 and ends at 2:15.
35. The use of ITV would conflict with my teaching style.
36. G.A.T.E. time (not enough)
37. Programs on level. As well as on needed topics.(Spec. Ed.-high school level info. or Elem. understanding)
38. Busy. Busy. Structured schedule.
39. It's a lot of trouble to get & set up TV for a 15 min. program. I need to use it for 5 classes & getting & setting up recording equip. is time consuming. Shows aren't scheduled when I'm teaching a particular unit.

Question #19 - continued:

40. Meaningfulness to hearing impaired students; also requires me to interpret the program which takes away from my being able to make the program useful as we go along (ex - point out special things etc.)

Question #22 - Check the media formats which account for most of your classroom use.

1. None (10)
2. Filmstrip (2)
3. Chalkboard (2)
4. Wash. Co. programs
5. Some of all
6. Video tapes
7. Video & County made curriculum
8. Videotapes of athletic practices/games.
9. Videotapes & loop film
10. Tape recorder
11. Tapes (cassette)
12. Art samples
13. Records, tapes
14. I am not familiar with any of these via ITV
15. Make own movies
16. Records
17. Opaque projector
18. Software discs

Question #28 - Have you personally seen any of the following outcomes among students in your class(es) which you would attribute to ITV?

1. Not applicable (18)
2. No (14)
3. Don't use ITV (13)
4. No observations (3)
5. Not applicable due to my teaching position.
6. I didn't use it enough this year to note any of these outcomes.
7. Pulls a group together socially.
8. Special Ed.
9. Seldom pay any attention.
10. Students very critical of quality.
11. Greater interest.
12. Hard to keep attention with large groups and small screen.
13. Enhances excitement in subject area.
14. Learn more songs.
15. Reinforces skills in concepts.
16. Keeps attention longer.
17. Little change.

Question #29 - For which types of students do you feel ITV is most useful?

1. I have not seen enough to comment. (2)
2. Have not used. (2)
3. Don't know. (2)
4. All students for enrichment.
5. In limited amounts.
6. Depends on the subject areas.
7. I feel it is useful to more than 1 of the above groups.
8. Career related.
9. Small groups.
10. I cannot judge!!
11. It depends on the programs.

Question #33 - How do you find out about the ITV broadcast schedule?

1. Media Specialist (Librarian) (26)
2. Media Center (5)
3. Never used ITV (3)
4. Receive schedule as member (2)
5. Don't know about this (2)
6. Not Applicable (2)
7. Librarian and English department chairperson
8. ITV representative
9. I only use videotapes
10. Principal sends me a catalog.
11. Fellow teacher
12. I have had the catalog/schedule in past years.
13. Have own schedule
14. Don't
15. IMC at school
16. College classroom
17. Have not been involved enough to find out
18. Tape